



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>



CF

TyT...

1/2
1/2
Ty+

HISTORY
OF
SCOTLAND.


By PATRICK FRASER TYTLER, Esq.

VOLUME VII.

3/

EDINBURGH:
WILLIAM TAIT, 107, PRINCES STREET.
MDCCCXL.

EXF




LONDON
THOMAS CURSON HANSARD, PATERNOSTER-ROW.

PREFACE.

THE volume of the History of Scotland now published embraces the eventful period between the marriage of Mary to Darnley, and the conclusion of the civil war, in 1572, a portion of our national annals which has been so deformed by controversy, that there is scarcely a single event in it of any importance, which has not been questioned, or distorted to suit the peculiar views of the antagonists or defenders of the Queen of Scots.

Under these circumstances, the Author, without adopting any preconceived notions, or espousing any favorite theory, has endeavoured to separate the truth from the tissue of fiction, passion, and

prejudice with which it has been obscured, and to put the reader in possession of a clear and authentic narrative of the facts. To attain this, he has examined with much care and labour, the Scottish, Domestic, and Foreign, correspondence, in the State Paper Office; and the authorities upon which this volume is founded are derived almost exclusively from the original letters of Elizabeth and Mary, of Burghley, Randolph, Leicester, Knox, Murray, Morton, and other actors in those dark and troubled times, which are preserved in that great national depository. At the same time he has consulted the rich original stores of the British Museum, and has availed himself of some valuable letters, preserved at Florence amongst the private archives of the House of Medici, in possession of the Grand Duke of Tuscany. These,



which form part of the interesting manuscript collections of Prince Labanoff relating to the life of Mary Queen of Scots, were most liberally and politely communicated to the Author by that nobleman.


An access to such materials has enabled the Author to add many new facts to this portion of Scottish history—as well as to throw new light upon the proper inferences derivable from what had been already established. In proof of this he may refer to the elucidation of the conspiracy for the murder of Riccio, and the clear implication of Elizabeth, Cecil, and the leaders of the protestants, in that deed, to the new details upon the death of Darnley, to the escape of Mary from Lochleven, one of those rare cases in which truth is found to assume the brilliant colours of romance, to

the assassination of Murray and Lennox, to the plot of Elizabeth, Mar, and Morton, for having Mary put secretly to death in Scotland, and to other parts of the volume.

But whilst he ventures to point out this, and to express a hope that in this and in the succeeding volume, which will terminate his labours, there is a nearer approach to truth than has yet been made, the Author is desirous of expressing his high respect for the labours of the eminent men who have preceded him, whose works, considering the imperfect materials they possessed are worthy of the highest praise.

HAMPSTEAD,

July 23rd, 1840.



CONTENTS

OF

THE SEVENTH VOLUME.

CHAP. I.


MARY.

FROM 1565 TO 1567.

From the marriage of Mary with Darnley to her marriage with Bothwell.

Mary's activity after her marriage,	PAGE 2
Mission of Tamworth,	3
Mary's remonstrances to Elizabeth,	5
Bothwell's return to Scotland,	9
Fears of the Protestant party,	10
Influence of Riccio,	11
Murray driven from Scotland,	13
Elizabeth's public severity to him,	15
He is secretly encouraged,	16
The Roman Catholic League,	18
Mary joins it,	20
Origin of the Conspiracy against Riccio,	21, 22
The plot known to Randolph,	23
Second stage of the Conspiracy,	25
Co-operation of the Protestants,	26, 27
The plot communicated to Burghley and Elizabeth,	30, 31
The murder of Riccio,	34, 35, 36
Mary's danger and terror,	38
Murray's return,	39
The Queen escapes to Dunbar,	41
Mary's advance to Edinburgh, and flight of Morton to Eng- land,	43
Mary discovers Darnley's guilt,	45
Joseph Riccio promoted,	46

Birth of James the Sixth	PAGE 48
Mary reconciles her nobility,	49
The King's unreasonable conduct,	52
Rage of the nobles against the King,	54, 55
Power of Bothwell,	56
Mary's visit to Bothwell at Harmitage,	58
Her dangerous illness,	60
Her great unhappiness,	61, 62
Secret conference at Craigmillar,	63, 64
Conspiracy against the King,	64
"Band" for the murder of Darnley,	65
Baptism of the Prince,	67
The King's illness,	69
Lennox and Darnley's designs against the Queen,	70, 71
Joseph Riccio and Joseph Lutyni,	72, 74
Return of Morton,	id.
Bothwell, Lethington, and Morton, resolve to murder the King,	75
Mary meets the King,	77
She brings him to the Kirk of Field,	80
Murder of Darnley,	83
Mary's delay in investigating the murder,	86
Bothwell continues in favour,	90
Letter from the Bishop of Glasgow,	92, 93
Elizabeth sends Killigrew to Scotland,	94
Trial of Bothwell resolved on,	96
Elizabeth's message to delay it,	97
Bothwell's acquittal,	100
Band of the nobles for his marriage with the Queen,	104, 105
Grange's letters against the Queen,	106
Anonymous letter to Cecil,	107
Bothwell carries the Queen to Dunbar,	108
Bothwell's divorce,	109
Robert Melvil's letter to Cecil,	111
Confederacy against Bothwell,	112
Communications with Elizabeth,	115
Craig publishes the banns of marriage between Mary and Bothwell,	117
Mary's marriage to Bothwell,	119



CHAP. II.

FROM 1567 TO 1569.

From Mary's marriage with Bothwell to the election of the Regent Murray.

General Indignation at Mary's Marriage	PAGE 120
Coalition of the Nobles against Bothwell	122
Mary sends the Bishop of Dumblane to France	124
Robert Melvil sent to Elizabeth	124
Bothwell's Letter to the English Queen	125
Attempt to surprise Bothwell and Mary at Borthwick Castle	128
Their escape to Dunbar	id.
Advance to Carberry Hill	130
Mary Surrenders to the Confederates	133
Bothwell suffered to escape	id.
Mary carried Captive to Edinburgh	136
Imprisonment in Lochleven Castle	137
Alleged intercepted Letters	139
Apprehension of Cullen and Blacater	141
Execution of Blacater	142
Convention of the Queen's Lords at Dumbarton	143
Knox's Return to Edinburgh	144
His vigorous Exertions	146
Mission and Transactions of Robert Melvil	148, 152
Melvin sent to Lochleven	153
Mission of Sir N. Throckmorton from Elizabeth	155
Elizabeth's secret acknowledgment of her unjust conduct to Mary	158
Mary's danger and Throckmorton's interference	159
Mary's conduct	160
Violent Enmity of the Presbyterian Clergy against Mary . . .	161
Robert Melvil sent again to Lochleven	162
His refusal to convey a Letter from Mary to Bothwell . . .	163
Meeting of the General Assembly	164
Mary compelled to resign the Crown, and Murray chosen Regent	166
Coronation of the Prince her Son	168

Elizabeth's severity to the Confederate Lords . . .	PAGE 170
Treacherous conduct of the faction of the Hamiltons	172, 173, 174
Expected return of Murray from France	175
Situation and expected measures of Murray . . .	176, 178
His interview with Elizabeth	179
His Arrival in Scotland	181
Remarkable interview with Mary at Lochleven . . .	183, 185
He is proclaimed Regent	187

CHAP. III.

FROM 1567 TO 1569.

Regency of the Earl of Murray.

Interview of Murray and Lethington with Throkmorton .	189
Throkmorton leaves Scotland	191
Murray's vigorous administration	192
His transactions with Sir James Balfour	193
His difficulties as to the king's murder	194
Submission of Huntly and Herries	195
Bothwell escapes to Norway	196
Parliament assembles—Lethington's speech	197
Its proceedings	198, 202
Murray's unfair dealing as to evidence of the king's murder	204, 205
Trials of the murderers	206
Discontent of the people	208
Murray's difficulties	209
Mary's escape from Lochleven	211
Murray's vigor and decision	214
Mary sends Beaton to France	215
Defeat of the Queen at Langsyde	217, 218
Mary's flight into England	221
Her letters to Elizabeth	222, 223
Murray accuses the queen of the king's murder, and offers to prove her guilt	224
Elizabeth's difficult situation	225, 227
Her message to Mary and to Murray	228
Mary's spirited answer	229
Cautious preliminary enquiries of Murray	230

CONTENTS.

xiii

Elizabeth's crafty answers.	PAGE 232
Conspiracy against Murray	233
Their disputes referred. Mary and the Regent to Elizabeth	234, 235
Murray names his Commissioners	237
The Queen of Scots names her Commissioners	239
Opening of the proceedings at York	240
Mary's complaint and Murray's reply	241
Intrigues of Norfolk	242, 245
Removal of the Conferences to Westminster	246
Murray's secret offers to Mary	247
Murray comes to London	248
His embarrassments	249
Conferences at Westminster	250, 251
Murray accuses Mary of the king's murder	253
Reply of Mary's commissioners	254
Elizabeth's refusal to hear Mary in person	255
Mary's commissioners break off the Conferences	257
Murray produces his proofs	Id.
Elizabeth's proceedings in consequence	259, 260
Mary offers to prove the forgery of the letters	261
Elizabeth pronounces her decision	263
Murray's answer to Mary's accusations	265
He returns to Scotland	Id.
Cecil offers Mary copies of the letters	Id.
General reflections	267, 268, 269
Murray's intrigues with Cecil	270
His difficulties	271
He overreaches Norfolk	272
His activity on his return to Scotland	273
A convention of the nobility agreed upon	274
Murray imprisons the Duke and Herries	276
He leads an army into the North	277
Submission of Huntly and Argyle	Id.
Projected marriage of Mary and Norfolk	278, 279
Norfolk's exertions and ambition	280, 281
Letters from Elizabeth to Murray	282
Throkmorton's letters on the marriage	283

Murray's duplicity	PAGE 284
Rejection of all proposals in Mary's favour	285
Norfolk's secret intrigues discovered	286
Norfolk sent to the Tower	287
Murray betrays him	288
Lethington accused of the King's murder	290
He is rescued by Kirkaldy of Grange	291
Rebellion of Northumberland	292, 293
Rebel earls fly to Scotland	294
Lethington's trial delayed	297
Murray seizes the Earl of Northumberland	298
Proposes to exchange Northumberland for Mary	299, 300
Knox's letter on this subject	300, 301
Mission of Elphinston to Elizabeth	301, 303
The Bishop of Ross counteracts his schemes	303
Assassination of the Regent Murray	304, 306
Reflections	308, 309

CHAP. IV.

FROM 1570 TO 1572.

Interregnum.—Regencies of Lennox and Mar.

State of Scotland on the death of Murray	311, 312
Difficulties of Elizabeth	313
Cecil's policy and advice	314
Lennox's letter to Elizabeth	315
Conference between Drury and Morton's party	316
Randolph sent into Scotland	317
Lethington pronounced guiltless of the King's murder	318
Rebellion of Leonard Dacres	319, 320
Miserable state of Scotland	320, 321
Relative strength of the two factions	321
Sir James Melvil's picture of the country	323
Randolph's intrigues	324
Verac arrives from France	325
Elizabeth's cruel policy	327
The Earl of Sussex invades Scotland	328
Lennox co-operates with him	329
Correspondence between Sussex and Lethington	332, 336

CONTENTS.

XV

Lennox made Lieutenant-governor of Scotland . . .	PAGE 337
Elizabeth's approval	338
Lennox chosen Regent	338, 339
Civil war	340
Sussex again invades Scotland	341
Abstinence	342
Elizabeth and Cecil's duplicity	343
Exasperation of the two factions	345
Randolph's defence of Murray's memory	346, 347
Knox's refusal to pray for the Queen	348, 349
Capture of Dumbarton Castle	350, 353
Execution of the Archbishop of St. Andrew's	353
Cecil's severe letter to Grange	355
Morton's return from England	356
Continuation of the civil war	357
Wretched state of the country	358
Rival parliaments	359, 360
Lennox and his party surprised in Stirling	361
Subsequent failure of the enterprise	362
Assassination of Lennox	362
His death	365
The Earl of Mar chosen Regent	365
Successes of Adam Gordon in the north	366, 367
Execution of Norfolk	368
Correspondence between Drury and Grange	368
Lethington's letter to Cecil	369
Elizabeth's policy	370
Ferocious character of the war	371
Successes of Mary's friends	372
They consent to a truce	373
Massacre of St. Bartholomew	374
Its effects on Elizabeth's policy	375
She is openly recommended to put Mary to death	376
Her public refusal	376
Secret plot of Elizabeth to have Mary put to death in Scotland	377
Mission of Henry Killigrew to Scotland	378
His secret instructions	379
His meeting with Morton	380

Negotiations of Nicholas Elphinston	PAGE 382
Burghley's letter	383
Killigrew consults Knox	384
His description of the Reformer	384
Knox co-operates with Killigrew	385
Killigrew's secret letter to Burghley and Leicester . . .	386
Mary not to be permitted to live three hours after she comes to Scotland	387, 389
Continuation of Killigrew's negotiation	390, 391
Mar consents	391
Death of the Regent Mar	392
Dismay and agitation of Burghley	393
Burghley's letter to Leicester	394
Northumberland's execution	395

CHAP. V.

FROM 1572 TO 1574.

Regency of Morton.

Elizabeth's measures on the death of Mar	397
Morton chosen Regent	398
Killigrew's advices to Burghley	399
Illness and death of Knox	400, 405
Episcopacy established in Scotland	407, 408
Submission of the Duke and Huntly	409
Condition of Mary's party	410, 411
Siege of the castle of Edinburgh	413, 415
Grange offers to surrender	416
His terms refused	417
Grange and Lethington surrender to the Queen of England .	418
Last letter of Grange and Lethington to Burghley . . .	419, 420
Death of Lethington	421
Efforts made to save Grange's life	422
Execution of Grange	423
Mary's cause desperate	424

PROOFS AND ILLUSTRATIONS

FROM

UNPRINTED MANUSCRIPTS.

- I. Historical Remarks on Knox's implication in Riccio's Murder.
- II. Plot of Lennox and Darnley against Mary's Crown and Life.
- III. Joseph Riccio and Joseph Lutyni.
- IV. Darnley's Murder.
- V. Bothwell's Trial.
- VI. Mary's Marriage with Bothwell.
- VII. Mary's Escape from Lochleven.
- VIII. Battle of Langsyde.
- IX. An Order for Mary's Execution in 1569.
- X. Elizabeth's Plot for the Secret Execution of Mary in Scotland.
- XI. Death of Mar.
- XII. Death of Grange,

HISTORY OF SCOTLAND.

CHAP. I.

1565 - 1567.

From the Marriage of Mary with Darnley to her Marriage with
Bothwell.

CONTEMPORARY PRINCES.

<i>England.</i>	<i>France.</i>	<i>Germany.</i>	<i>Spain.</i>	<i>Portugal.</i>	<i>Pope.</i>
Elizabeth.	Charles IX.	Maximilian II.	Philip II.	Sebastian.	Pius IV.

PREVIOUS to her marriage with Darnley, Mary had become assured that Murray and his faction were ready to rise in rebellion against her government if they met with the least encouragement from England; after this event, every day convinced her that Randolph, the English Ambassador, was using all his efforts to induce her barons to throw off their allegiance, and that Elizabeth not only approved of their proceedings, but secretly stimulated them to revolt.¹

To prepare for this emergency, the Scottish

¹ MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Earl of Murray to Cecil. Carlisle, Oct. 14, 1565. [I may here observe where the words *MS. letter* occur in this volume, the reader may consider the letter to be an original. When I quote a Copy, the word Copy is subjoined.]

Queen summoned her subjects to meet her in arms in the capital.¹ Her safety lay in promptitude and decision ; she resolved to anticipate the movements of her opponents before it was possible for them to receive succour from England ; and in this her efforts were eminently successful. Three days after her marriage, Murray was commanded to appear at court, under the penalty of being proclaimed a rebel, and having failed, he was “ put to the horn,” as it was termed, that is, his life and estates were declared forfeited to the laws ; upon which Randolph, in a letter addressed to the Queen of England, implored her to strengthen the hands of the English party in Scotland, and to save them from utter ruin.² He wrote also to the Earl of Bedford, an old and tried friend of Murray, urging him to use his influence to procure instant assistance, and assuring him, that if the English borderers could be let loose at this crisis, so as to keep their Scottish neighbours employed, the Queen and Darnley would be reduced to great distress.³ His letters to Elizabeth contained an alarming picture of affairs in Scotland. He represented religion, by which

¹ MS. Proclamation. St. P. Off. . July 16, 1565. Copy of the time endorsed by Randolph.

² MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Randolph to the queen. [When in the notes to this volume, I use the words “ *to the Queen*,” in quoting any letter, the Queen of England is meant.] 23 July, 1565. Edinburgh.

³ MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Randolph to Bedford. Edinburgh. 24 July, 1565.

he meant protestantism, as in danger, and affirmed that the amity between the two kingdoms was on the point of being broken : but the English queen was slow to credit all his statements, and contented herself with dispatching Mr. Tamworth, one of the gentlemen of her bed-chamber, to the Scottish court, with the vain object of accomplishing a reconciliation between Mary and the Earl of Murray.¹

This, however, was now impossible. The Scottish queen, convinced that Murray's sole purpose was to recover the power which he had lost, allowed her enemies no time to concentrate their strength, but at the head of a force which defied opposition, compelled them to fly from Stirling to Glasgow, and from Glasgow to Argyle.² She then returned to Edinburgh, where Tamworth had arrived, and this envoy being admitted to an audience, was received by Mary with a spirit for which he seems not to have been prepared.³

In the letter which Elizabeth sent to this princess, she had affected to treat with contempt her pretensions to the English throne, and her practices with foreign powers, but Mary could express

¹ MS. Letter St. P. Off. Tamworth and Randolph to Cecil. Edinburgh, 10 Aug. 1565.

² Diurnal of Occurrents, p. 82. Keith p. 316. MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Mary to the Master of Maxwell. Copy. Edinburgh, 23 August 1565.

³ MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Tamworth and Randolph to Cecil, Edinburgh, 10 Aug. 1565.

herself as severely, though with greater command of temper than her sister of England. After defending her marriage, and remonstrating against the uncalled-for interference of Elizabeth, she turned to the subject of the succession. I am not, said she, so lowly born, nor yet have I such small alliances abroad, that if compelled by your mistress to enter into 'practices' with foreign powers, she shall find them of such small account as she believes. The place which I fill in relation to the succession to the Crown of England, is no vain or imaginary one, and by God's grace, it shall appear to the world, that my designs and consultations shall prove as substantial as those which at any time my neighbours have taken in hand.¹

But although she repelled Elizabeth's haughty and sarcastic insinuations, Mary was sincerely desirous of peace. To promote this, she promised Randolph all that could justly be required. She could not consent indeed to renounce her title to a throne to which she held her claim to be undoubted, but she was ready to come under the most solemn obligation that neither she nor her husband should attempt any thing to the prejudice of the English queen or of her issue, and that whenever God called them to the possession of their right in England, no alteration should be made in the religion, laws, or liberties, of that ancient kingdom. In return, she insisted on the performance of two conditions, the

¹ MS. St. P. Off. Answers given by the queen of Scots to "Articles" proponed by Mr. Tamworth. 12 August, 1565.

first that Elizabeth, by Act of Parliament, should settle the English crown upon herself and Darnley, in the first instance, and in default of them and their children on the Lady Margaret, Countess of Lennox ; the second, that she should offer no countenance or assistance to her rebels.¹

In this last stipulation Mary was peremptory ; for she had discovered that Randolph, the English ambassador, intrigued with Murray, and she then suspected (what is now established beyond a doubt by the original letters of the actors in these unworthy scenes) that Elizabeth's advice and encouragement were at the bottom of the whole rebellion. Without waiting therefore for any further communication from England, she deemed it proper to take a determined step. The English ambassador was informed that he must either promise upon his honour to renounce all intercourse with her rebels, or be put under the charge of those who should take care to detect and restrain his practices : Randolph's reply to the Privy Council was more a defiance than an answer. " I will promise nothing," said he, " either on honour, honesty, word, or writing, and as for guards to attend me, they shall fare full ill, unless stronger and better armed than my own servants." Lethington, the secretary, then proposed that he should retire to Berwick, but this, too, he peremptorily refused. " Wheresoever

¹ MS. St. P. Off. Offers made by the queen of Scots to the queen's majesty of England. Wholly in Randolph's hand, and endorsed by Cecil. 13 Aug. 1565.

the queen, your mistress, keeps her court," was his reply, "there, or not far off, is my place. If I am driven from this, it is easy to see what mind is borne to my sovereign."¹ His insolence encouraged Tamworth to equal arrogance: he refused to give Darnley the royal title, and declined accepting a passport, because it bore his signature as king: but this ill judged presumption cost him dear. On his way home, a hint having been given to the borderers, he was waylaid, maltreated, and carried a prisoner to Hume Castle, from which he addressed a letter to Cecil, detailing his sorrowful adventure.²

In the meantime Elizabeth amused the insurgent barons by large promises, and small pecuniary advances, and thus encouraged, Murray, the duke, and Glencairn, at the head of a thousand men, advanced to Edinburgh, which they entered on the last day of August.³ The movement proved to be ill judged, and premature. The citizens received them coldly—not a man joined their ranks; it was in vain they endeavoured to excite an alarm that

¹ MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Randolph to Cecil, Edinburgh, 20 Aug. 1565. [As these inverted comma's may possibly mislead a reader, I beg to say, that where they occur, as they do here in reporting any conversation or dialogue, they do not always indicate that the passages are given strictly word for word. Sometimes, indeed, the very words are given; but sometimes only the sense.]

² MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Tamworth to Cecil. Hume Castle. Aug. 21, 1565.

³ MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Randolph to Cecil. Edinburgh, 31 Aug. 1565. Same to the same, 1 Sept. 1565.

religion was in danger; in vain they addressed a letter to the queen, in which they threatened that if she continued to pursue them, their blood should be dearly bought,¹ in vain that they dispatched urgent entreaties for assistance to Bedford and Cecil.² Before time was given for reply, Mary had marched against them, a cannonade was opened from the castle, and they were compelled with precipitation and dismay, to abandon the capital and retire to Dumfries.³ From this place they dispatched Robert Melvil, brother to the well known Sir James Melvil, to the English court. He was instructed to require the immediate assistance of three thousand men, and the presence of some ships of war in the Firth.⁴

With these exorbitant demands Elizabeth could not possibly have complied unless she had been prepared to rush into open war: she was now convinced that Randolph had misled or deceived her, by overrating the strength of the insurgents. She had believed that the whole country was ready to

¹ MS. Letter, St. P. Off. contemporary copy. Letter from the lords to the queen, sent from Edinburgh to Glasgow. 1 Sept. 1565.

² MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Border Correspondence; [henceforth to be marked simply by the letters B.C.] Bedford to Cecil. Berwick, 2 Sept. 1565. *Ibid.* Randolph to Cecil, 2d. Sept. 1565. Edinburgh.

³ MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Randolph to Cecil. Edinburgh, 4 Sept. 1565.

⁴ MS. St. P. Off. Instructions given to Robert Melvil, 10 Sep. 1565.

rise against the government of Mary and Darnley, and a short time before Melvil's arrival, had directed Bedford to assist them both with money and soldiers.¹ On discovering, however, the real weakness of Murray's faction, these orders were countermanded, and the insurgents found themselves in the alarming predicament of having risen in rebellion, trusting to succours which never arrived.²

Nor did Mary give Elizabeth time, even had she so determined, to save her friends. Before a company of horse, pikes, or bowmen, could have reached the borders, the Scottish queen had swept with her forces through Fife, inflicted chastisement on the Laird of Grange and other barons who had joined the rebels, levied a heavy fine on the towns of Dundee and St. Andrew's, seized Castle Campbell, and prepared, at the head of an army which rendered opposition fruitless, to attack the rebel lords at Dumfries. So keen was she in the pursuit, that she rode with pistols at her saddle bow, and declared to Randolph, that she would rather peril her crown, than lose her revenge.³

At this crisis, the Earl of Bothwell returned from

¹ The Queen to Bedford, Sep. 12, 1565. Appendix to Robertson's History of Scotland, vol. i. No. 13.

² MS. Letter. St. P. Off. Lords of Scotland to Mr. Melvil, 15 Sep., 1565. Dumfries.

³ MS. Letter. St. P. off. Randolph to Cecil, Edinburgh. Sept. 9, 1565. *Ibid.* Same to the same, Edinburgh. Aug. 27, 1565. *Ibid.* Same to the same, Edinburgh. Sept. 4, 1565.

France, profiting by the disgrace of Murray, whose power had expelled him from his country. He was favourably received by the queen, although well known to be a rash, daring, and profligate man ; but his extensive border estates gave him much power, and the circumstances in which Mary was placed made her welcome any baron who could bring a formidable force into the field.¹ In his company came David Chambers, a person of a dark, intriguing spirit, who had long been a retainer of this nobleman, and although a lord of the session, more likely to outrage than administer the law.

Aware that the arrival of such partizans would be followed by the most determined measures, the rebel lords made a last effort to alarm Elizabeth on the subject of religion. They transmitted to Robert Melvil, their envoy in England, a paper entitled “ Informations to be given to the Queen’s Majesty, in favour of the Church of Christ, now begun to be persecuted in the chief members of the same.”² Even the title of this paper contained a misrepresentation of the truth, for at this moment, so far from persecution, there was complete religious toleration in Scotland. Its contents, too, were of questionable accuracy, certainly highly coloured. Melvil was directed to assure the Eng-

¹ MS. St. P. Off. Randolph to Cecil, Edinburgh, Sep. 19 and 20, 1565. Same to the same, Edinburgh, Sept. 1, 1565.

² MS. St. P. Off. Informations given to the queen’s Majesty of England, and the Council, in favour of religion in Scotland, Sep. 22, 1565.

lish queen, that nothing was meant by Mary and him who was now joined with her, but the utter subversion of the religion of Jesus Christ within the realm, and the erecting again of all papistry and superstition. "The cause," said they, "why our destruction is sought, is, first the zeal that we bear to the maintenance of the true religion; and secondly, the care that we have to redress the great enormities lately crept into the public regimen of this miserable commonwealth." The patrimony of the crown was described as so dilapidated, that it was impossible the common expenses could be borne, and this they affirmed had led to the persecution of honourable men, and the promotion of crafty foreigners, chiefly two Italians, David Riccio, and Francisco, who, with other unworthy persons, occupied the place in council belonging to the ancient nobility. As to the Earl of Murray, he was hated, they said, because he would not support Riccio in his abuses, whilst a stranger (meaning Darnley), the subject of another realm, had intruded himself into the state, and claimed the name and authority of a king, without their consent, against all order that ever was used in this realm; and now, because they desired redress of these great enormities, they were persecuted as traitors and enemies to the commonwealth.¹

Although in some parts exaggerated, these fears and accusations were not without foundation. Mary

¹ Id : Ut supra.

had undoubtedly negotiated with the Roman See for an advance of money, and the pope had transmitted to her the sum of eight thousand crowns in a vessel, which, being wrecked on the coast of England, fell a prey to the cupidity of the Earl of Northumberland.¹

She was in correspondence also with Philip II., who had expressed to the Cardinal Pacheco, the papal envoy, his determination to assist her to subdue her rebels, maintain the catholic faith, and vindicate her right to the English throne. Nor did the Spanish king confine himself to mere promises. He had sent a remittance of twenty thousand crowns to Guzman de Silva, his ambassador at the court of England, with orders to employ it “with the utmost secrecy and address, in the support of the Scottish queen and her husband.”² It was true, also, that Mary had appointed Riccio to the place of French secretary. This foreigner, who was a Milanese, had come to Scotland in the train of Moret, the Savoy ambassador, and his ambition was at first satisfied with the humble office of a singer in the queen’s band, but being well educated, he was occasionally employed in other matters, and on the dismissal of Raulet, her French secretary,

¹ Keith, p. 316.

² Gonzalez Apuntamientos para la Historia del Rey Felipe II., p. 312, published in vol. vii. of the Memoirs of the Historical Society of Madrid. The work was pointed out to me by a kind and respected friend to whom I am indebted for some valuable papers and references, Mr. Howard, of Corby Castle.

Mary rewarded his talent with the vacant office. But when betrayed, as she had repeatedly been by her own nobility, to whom office, but not fidelity, was transmitted by birth, it was not wonderful that the queen employed those whom she could better trust, and, on the whole, the arguments of the insurgents produced little effect upon Elizabeth. She was convinced of the power and popularity of the Scottish queen; the feebleness of Murray and his associates, whom she had bribed into rebellion, was proved beyond a doubt, and the moment this was discovered, they were abandoned to their fate, without pity or remorse. True to her wonted dissimulation in all state policy, she assured them that she still favoured their enterprise, and was moved by their distress, but no remonstrances of Murray, who loudly declared that desertion was ruin, could extort from her either money or troops.¹ At this moment, Monsieur de Mauvissiere, better known as the Sieur de Castelnau, was in England, whither he had been sent by his master, the French king, to accomplish, if possible, a reconciliation between Mary and Elizabeth. By the advice of Cecil, Mauvissiere and Cockburn, the last a creature of this minister, and known to Mary as an archer in the Scottish guard, repaired to Scotland, and made an attempt to procure a pardon for Murray and his associates. To both, the queen readily gave audience, and the picture given by them of the miser-

¹ MS. St. P. Off. An answer for Robert Melvil, Oct. 2, 1565. Entirely in Cecil's hand.

able and distracted state of her kingdom was so sad and true, as to draw many tears from her eyes ;¹ but when the terms upon which they proposed to mediate were stated, her spirit rose against the imperious dictation of Elizabeth, she dismissed the envoys, and proceeded instantly against her rebels, who still lay, with a few horse, at Dumfries. On advancing at the head of her army, Lord Maxwell, the most powerful baron in these quarters, hastened to make his submission, and Murray, with the chiefs of his faction, fled in terror to Carlisle.*

From this city the Scottish earl addressed a letter of remonstrance to Cecil, imploring his mistress to save them from the wreck of "honour, conscience, and estate." On the other hand, Mary, a few days before, had written in spirited terms to Elizabeth. It had been reported she said, much to her astonishment, that her sister of England intended to protect her rebellious subjects who had fled to the borders. She declared her unwillingness to give credit to such tales, but should they prove true, should she make common cause with such traitors, she avowed her resolution to denounce such wrongful dealings to all the foreign princes who were her allies. The English queen was alarmed. The French and Spanish ambassadors took Mary's part, and accused Elizabeth, in

¹ MS. Letter. St. P. Off., Edinburgh. Oct. 2, 1565, Captain Cockburn to Cecil. "She wept wondrous sore."

² MS. Letter. St. P. Off. B.C., Bedford to Cecil. Carlisle, Oct. 14, 1565.

no measured terms, of fomenting civil commotions in other realms, that she might avert danger from her own ; it was her favourite policy, they affirmed, Scotland proved it, and at this instant the rebels there acted by her encouragement, and, in their distress, looked to her as their last resource.

Murray, by this time, was travelling to the English Court, and Elizabeth found herself in an awkward predicament ; but it was necessary to take immediate measures, and those which she adopted strongly marked her character ; an envoy was hurried off to command the Scottish earl and his friends, on pain of her displeasure, to remain at a distance. This was the public message intended to vindicate her fair dealing to the world. The messenger encountered and stopped Murray at Ware : here the earl remained, and here he soon received a secret message, permitting him to come forward.¹ He obeyed, and was admitted into the presence of the English queen, but it was to be made an actor in a scene which overwhelmed him with confusion. She had summoned the French and Spanish ambassadors to be present. Murray and the Abbot of Kilwinning entered the apartment, fell upon their knees, and implored her intercession with the queen, their mistress. “ I am astonished,” said Elizabeth, “ that you have dared without warning to come before me ; are you not branded as rebels

¹ MS. Letter, St. P. Off. B. C. Murray to the Privy Council, Ware, Oct. 21, 1565. Copy MS., St. P. Off., of the speech to the Earl of Murray. Oct. 23, partly in Cecil's hand.

to your sovereign? have you not spurned her summons, and taken arms against her authority? I command you, on the faith of a gentleman, to declare the truth." Murray repelled the charge of treason, lamented that he was encompassed with enemies, who made it dangerous for him to come to court, and declared that the accusation that he had plotted to seize the person of his sovereign, and had been encouraged in his rebellion by the Queen of England, was utterly false and ridiculous; the whole pageant had evidently been arranged beforehand,¹ and Elizabeth's answer was in perfect keeping.

Turning in proud triumph to the foreign ambassadors, she bade them mark his words, and then, with an expression of anger and contempt, she addressed Murray and the Abbot of Killwinning, still on their knees before her:—"It is well," said she, "that you have told the truth: for neither did I, nor any one else in my name, ever encourage you in your unnatural rebellion against your sovereign, nor, to be mistress of a world, could I maintain any subject in disobedience to his prince: it might move God to punish me by a similar trouble in my own realm:—but as for you two, ye are unworthy traitors, and I command you instantly to leave my presence."²

The earl and his friend were then ignomini-

¹ MS. St. P. Off. Copy of the Queen's speech to the Earl of Murray, before the French ambassador, the *Sieur de Mauvissiere*, and the Queen's Council. Also *Melvil's Memoirs*, p. 57.

² *Id* : ut *supra*.

ously driven from court, and care was taken to render as public as possible the severe treatment they had received, so that the news soon reached the court in Scotland, and occasioned great triumph to the party of Mary and the king. "All the contrary faction," said Randolph, in a letter from Edinburgh, to Cecil, "are discouraged and think themselves utterly undone."¹ Nor did they want good reason to think so, for the Scottish queen summoned a Parliament to meet in February, and it was publicly declared that the forfeiture of Murray and his adherents was the principal business to be brought before it.²

It is scarcely necessary here to repeat what has been apparent, from innumerable examples in the course of this history, that feudal forfeiture was in these days equivalent to absolute ruin, that it stripped the most potent baron at once of his whole estates and authority, throwing him either as an outcast upon the charity of some foreign country, or exposing him to be hunted down by those vassals whose allegiance followed the land, and not the lord.

To avert this dreadful calamity, Murray exerted himself to the utmost. He interceded with Leicester, he wrote to Cecil, imploring him to save him from being "wrecked for ever."³ He ad-

¹ MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Randolph to Cecil, Edinburgh. Nov. 8, 1565.

² MS.. Letter, St. P. Off. Randolph to Cecil, Edinburgh. Dec. 23, 1565.

³ MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Murray to Cecil, Newcastle. Jan. 9, 1565-6. Also MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Murray to Leicester, Newcastle, Dec. 25, 1565.

addressed a letter to Elizabeth, and he even condescended to court Riccio.

The influence of this Milanese adventurer had been gradually increasing. At this moment Maitland of Lethington, the secretary of state, was suspected of having been nearly connected with the rebellion of Murray,¹ and, as a trustworthy servant was a prize rarely to be found, the queen began to consult her French secretary in affairs of secrecy and moment. The step was an imprudent one, and soon attended with the worst effects. It roused the jealousy of the king, a weak and suspicious youth, who deemed it an affront that a stranger of low origin should presume to interfere in state affairs; and it turned Riccio's head, who began to assume, in his dress, equipage, and establishment, a foolish state totally unsuited to his rank.² In the meantime, his influence was great, and Murray bespoke his good offices by the present of a rich diamond, with a letter soliciting his assistance.³

Had Mary been left to herself, there is little doubt that her rebels would have been pardoned. Her natural generosity and the intercession of some powerful friends, strongly impelled her to the side of mercy;⁴ and she had already consented to delay

¹ MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Randolph to Cecil, Edinburgh, 1st. Dec. 1565.

² Spottiswood, p. 193.

³ Sir James Melvil's Memoirs, p. 147. Bannatyne Club edition.

⁴ Sir J. Melvil, p. 146.

the parliament, and to entertain proposals for the restoration of the banished lords, when an unforeseen circumstance occurred, which led to unfortunate results. This was the arrival of two gentlemen, de Rambouillet and Clernau, on a mission from the French court. Their message was outwardly one of mere ceremony, to invest the young king with the order of St. Michael, but amid the festivities attendant on the installation, a more important and secret communication took place. Clernau, the special envoy of the Cardinal Lorraine, and Thornton, a messenger from Beaton, the Scottish ambassador in France, who had come to court about the same time, informed Mary of the coalition which had been concluded between France, Spain, and the Emperor, for the destruction of the Protestant cause in Europe. It was a design worthy of the dark and unscrupulous politicians by whom it had been planned—Catherine of Medici, and the Duke of Alva. In the summer of the preceding year, the queen dowager of France and Alva had met at Bayonne, during a progress, in which she conducted her youthful son and sovereign, Charles IX., through the southern provinces of his kingdom. And there, whilst the court was dissolved in pleasure, those secret conferences were held which issued in the resolution that toleration must be at an end, and that the only safety for the Roman Catholic faith was the extermination of its enemies.¹

¹ Keith, p. 325, Mezerai *Abrege Chronologique de L'Histoire de*

Thornton accordingly brought from the Cardinal Lorraine the "*Band*" or League which had been drawn up on this occasion ; it was whispered that some of her friends in England were parties to it, and Mary was strongly urged to become a member of the coalition. Her intention of pardoning Murray and her other rebels was at the same time opposed by these foreign envoys, with the utmost earnestness. It was represented as her only safe policy to crush, while she had it in her power, that busy Protestant faction which had been so long encouraged, and was even at this moment secretly supported by Elizabeth, and to join that sacred League, to which she was united, as well by the bonds of a mutual faith, as by those of blood and affection. If she adopted this method, it was argued, her authority within her realm would be placed upon a secure foundation ; if she neglected it, her misfortunes, however complicated they had already been, were only in their commencement.

Riccio, who at this moment possessed much influence, and was on good grounds suspected to be a pensioner of Rome, seconded these views with all his power. On the other hand she did not want advisers on the side of wisdom and mercy. Sir James Melvil, in Scotland, and Sir Nicholas Throckmorton, one of her most powerful friends in England, earnestly implored her to pardon Mur-

France, vol. v. p. 87-8, Randolph to Cecil, February 7, 1565-6. Robertson's Appendix, No. xiv. ; also Bedford to Cecil, 13 February, 1565-6, British Museum. Caligula, B. X. fol. 391.

ray and adopt a conciliatory course.' Mary was not naturally inclined to harsh or cruel measures, and for some time she vacillated between the adoption of temperate and violent counsels. But now the entreaties of her uncle the cardinal, the advice of her ambassador, the prejudices of her education, and the intolerance of the Protestants, and of Elizabeth, by whom she had been so often deceived, all united to influence her decision, and overmaster her better judgment. In an evil hour she signed the League, and determined to hurry on the parliament for the forfeiture of the rebels. This may, I think, be regarded as one of the most fatal errors of her life; and it proved the source of all her future misfortunes. She united herself to a bigotted and unprincipled association, which, under the mask of defending the truth, offered an outrage to the plainest precepts of the Gospel. She imagined herself a supporter of the Catholic Church, when she was giving her sanction to one of the worst corruptions of Romanism; and she was destined to reap the consequences of such a step in all their protracted bitterness.

The moment the queen's resolution was known, it blasted the hopes of Murray, and threw him and all Mary's enemies upon desperate courses. If the Estates were allowed to meet, the consequence to them was ruin; if the councillors continued unchanged, and Riccio's advice was followed, it was

¹ Sir J. Melvil's Memoirs, pp. 141, 144.

certain the Estates would meet. What then was to be done? The time was fast running on, and the remedy, if there was to be any, must be sudden. Such being the crisis, it was, at once, determined that the meeting of parliament should be arrested, the government of the queen and her ministers overturned; and that, to effect this, Riccio must be murdered. This last atrocious expedient was no new idea, for the seeds of an unformed conspiracy against the foreign favorite, had been sown some time before; and of this Murray's friends now availed themselves, artfully uniting the two plots into one, the object of which was the return of Murray, the dethronement of the queen, and the re-establishment of the Protestant leaders in the power which they had lost.

The origin, growth, and subsequent combination, of these two conspiracies have never yet been understood, although they can be distinctly traced. The first plot for the death of Riccio was, strange to say, formed by no less personages than the young king and his father, the Earl of Lennox. It had its rise in the jealousy and ambition of these unprincipled men, and the imprudent conduct of Mary. In the early ardour of her affection, the queen had promised Darnley the *crown matrimonial*, by which was meant an equal share with herself in the government; but after a few months she had the misery to discover, that her love had been thrown away upon a husband whom it was impossible for her to treat with confidence or respect. He was fickle, proud, and sus-

picious ; ambitious of power, yet incapable of business, and the easy dupe of every crafty or interested companion whom he met. It became necessary for Mary to draw back from her first promise. This led to coldness, to reproaches, soon to an absolute estrangement ; even in public he treated her with harshness ; he became addicted to low dissipation,¹ forsook her company, and threw himself into the hands of her enemies. They persuaded him that Riccio was the sole author of those measures which had deprived him of his due share in the government. But this was not all, Darnley had the folly to become the dupe of a more absurd delusion. He became jealous of the Italian secretary ; he believed that he had supplanted him in the affections of the queen ; he went so far as to assert that he had dishonoured his bed, and in a furious state of mind sent his cousin George Douglas to implore Lord Ruthven, in whom he had great confidence, to assist him against “ the villain David.”² Ruthven was at this moment confined to bed by a dangerous sickness, which might have been supposed to unfit him for such desperate projects. He was, as he himself informs us, “ scarcely able to walk twice the length of his chamber ;” yet he consented to engage in the murder, and Darnley was sworn to keep all

¹ Drury to Cecil, 16th Feb. 1565-6. Keith, 329.

² This was about the 10th February. Ruthven's Narrative in Keith, Appendix, p. 119 ; and Caligula, B. ix. f. 219. MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Ruthven and Morton to Cecil, 27th March, 1566.

secret ; but Randolph, the English minister, having become acquainted with the plot, revealed it to Leicester in a remarkable letter which yet remains. He informed him that the king and his father, Lennox, were determined to murder Riccio ; that within ten days the deed would be done ; that, as to the queen, the crown would be torn from her whose dishonour was discovered ; and that still darker designs were meditated against her person, which he did not dare to commit to writing. From his letter, which is very long, I must give this important passage. “ I know now for certain,” said he, “ that this queen repenteth her marriage ; that she hateth him (Darnley) and all his kin. I know that he knoweth himself, that he hath a partaker in play and game with him ; I know that there are practices in hand, contrived between the father and son to come by the crown against her will. I know that if that take effect which is intended, David, with the consent of the king, shall have his throat cut within these ten days. Many things grievouser and worse than these are brought to my ears ; yea, of things intended against her own person, which, because I think better to keep secret than write to Mr. Secretary, I speak not of them but now to your lordship.”¹

At this time Randolph, who, from the terms

¹ Randolph to the Earl of Leicester, Edinburgh, 13 February, 1565-6. This remarkable letter, which has never been published, is to be found in the Appendix to a privately printed and anonymous work, entitled “ Maitland’s Narrative,” of which only twenty

in which he described it, appears to have had no objection to the plot, was banished by Mary to Berwick, the queen having now discovered certain proof of his having encouraged and assisted Murray in his rebellion.¹ To supply his place, Ruthven, who perceived that the king's intent to murder the Italian gave him a good opportunity to labour for the return of his banished friends, called in the Earl of Morton, then chancellor of the kingdom.² This powerful and unscrupulous man proved an able assistant. Under his father, the noted George Douglas, he had been early familiarized with intrigue. He hated Riccio, and dreaded the assembling of parliament almost as much as Murray, from a report that he was to be deprived of certain crown lands, which had been improperly obtained, and to lose the seals as chancellor.³ Morton, too, was the personal friend of Murray; like him he belonged to

copies were printed. The book was politely presented to me by Mr. Dawson Turner, in whose valuable Collection of MSS. the original letter is preserved.

¹ MS. Letter communicated to me by the Hon. William Leslie Melvil; Mary to Melvil, 17 February, 1565-6.; A copy—Mary confronted Randolph before the Privy Council, with Johnston, the person to whom he had delivered the money to be conveyed to Murray; and the evidence being considered conclusive, he received orders to quit the court, and retired to Berwick.

² Narrative ut supra. Keith, p. 120, Appendix." MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Morton and Ruthven to Cecil, Berwick, 27th March, 1566.

³ MS. Letter St. P. Off. Randolph to Cecil, Berwick, 6 March, 1565.

the party of the reformed Church ; and when Ruthven and Darnley solicited his aid, he at once embraced the proposal for the murder of the secretary, and proceeded to complete the machinery of the conspiracy, with greater skill than his fierce but less artful associates.

His first endeavour was to strengthen their hands by procuring the co-operation of the party of the reformed church ; his next, to follow out Ruthven's idea, by drawing in Murray, and making the plot the means of his return to power ; his last to secure the countenance and support of Elizabeth and her chief ministers, Cecil and Leicester.

In all this he succeeded. The consent and assistance of the leading Protestant barons, was soon gained, and to neutralize any opposition on the part of their chief ministers was not found a difficult matter.¹ They were in the deepest alarm at this moment. It was known that Mary had signed the Popish League ; it was believed that Riccio corresponded with Rome, and there was no doubt that some measures for the restoration of the Roman Catholic religion were in preparation, and only waited for the parliament to be carried into execution.² Having these gloomy prospects before their eyes, Knox and

¹ MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Morton and Ruthven to Cecil, 27th March, 1566.

² Mary's own words in her letter describing the murder of Riccio, addressed to Beaton, her ambassador at the French court, are quite explicit upon this point. "The spiritual estate (says she) being placed therein in the ancient manner tending to have done some good anent restoring *the auld Religion*." Keith, p. 331.

Craig, the ministers of Edinburgh, were made acquainted with the conspiracy ;¹ Bellenden, the justice clerk, Makgill the clerk register, the lairds of Brunston, Calder and Ormiston, and other leading men of that party were, at the same time, admitted into the secret. It was contended by Morton, that one only way remained to extirpate the Romish faith, and replace religion upon a secure basis ; this was, to break off the parliament, by the murder of Riccio, to imprison the queen, entrust Darnley with the nominal sovereignty, and restore the Earl of Murray to be the head of the government. Desperate as were these designs, the Reformed party in Scotland did not hesitate to adopt them. Their horror of Idolatry, the name they bestowed on the Roman Catholic religion, misled their judgment and hardened their feelings, and they regarded the plot as the act of men raised up by God for the destruction of an accursed superstition. The General Fast, which always secured the presence of a formidable and numerous band of partisans, was near approaching ; and as the murder had been fixed for the week in March, in which the parliament had been summoned, it was contrived that this religious solemnity should be held in the capital at the same time. This secured Morton and enabled him to work with greater boldness.²

Having so far organized the conspiracy, it re-

¹ See the evidence on which this fact is now stated for the first time in Proofs and Illustrations, No. I.

² MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Morton and Ruthven to Cecil, 27th March, 1566. Knox, Hist. p. 341, 342.

mained to communicate it to Murray, and for this purpose, the king's father the Earl of Lennox repaired to England.¹ It required no great persuasion to induce Murray, now in banishment, and over whose head forfeiture and ruin were impending, to embrace a plot which promised to avert all danger, and restore him to the station he had lost. It was accordingly arranged by him, with Grange, Ochiltree, the father-in-law of Knox, and the other banished lords, that as soon as the day for the murder was fixed, they should be informed of it, and then order matters so that their return to Edinburgh should take place instantly after it was committed.² But this was not all. According to a common but revolting practice of this age, which combined the utmost feudal ferocity with a singular love of legal formalities, it was resolved, that "Covenants" or contracts for the commission of the murder, and the benefits to be derived from it should be entered into, and signed by the young king himself and the rest of the conspirators. Two "Bands," or "Covenants," were accordingly drawn up: the first ran in the king's name alone, although many were parties to it. It stated that the queen's "gentle and good nature" was abused by some wicked and ungodly persons, specially an Italian

¹ Calderwood MS. Brit. Mus. Ayscough, 4735, f. 642.

² MS. Letter, St. P. Off., Edinburgh, February 25, 1565, i. e. 1565-6. Randolph to Cecil—also Ibid. March 8, 1565. Berwick. Bedford, and Randolph to Leicester and Cecil. Ibid. MS. Letter, Murray to Cecil, Newcastle, March 8, 1565-6.

stranger called David ; it declared his resolution, with the assistance of certain of his nobility and others, to seize these enemies; and if any difficulty or resistance occurred, “ to cut them off immediately, and slay them wherever it happened,” and solemnly promised on the word of a prince, to maintain and defend his assistants and associates in the enterprise, though carried into execution in presence of the queen’s majesty, and within the precincts of the palace.¹ By whom this agreement was signed, besides the King, Morton, and Ruthven, does not appear ; but it is certain that its contents were communicated amongst others to Murray, Argile, Rothes, Maitland, Grange, and the Lords Boyd and Lindsay. Of these persons, some were in England, and could not personally assist in the assassination ; and to them, among others, Morton and Ruthven no doubt alluded, when they afterwards declared, that the most honest and the most worthy, were easily induced to approve of the intended murder, and to support their prince in its execution.² The second “ Covenant” has been also preserved. It was supplementary to the first, its purpose being to bind the king on the one hand, and the conspirators on the other, to the performance of those conditions which were considered for their mutual advantage. The parties to it were the

¹ Brit. M. Caligula, B. ix. fol. 212, Copy of the time. Endorsed by Randolph.

² MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Morton and Ruthven to Cecil. Berwick, March, 27, 1566. Also Keith, p. 120.

King, the Earls of Murray, Argyle, Glencairn, and Rothes, the Lords Boyd and Ochiltree, and their "complices." They promised to support Darnley in all his just quarrels, to be friends to his friends, and enemies to his enemies; to give him the crown matrimonial, to maintain the protestant religion, to put down its enemies, and uphold every reform founded on the word of God. For his part, the king engaged to pardon Murray and the banished lords, to stay all proceedings for their forfeiture, and to restore them to their lands and dignities.¹

Such was now the forward state of the conspiracy for the murder of Riccio, the restoration of Murray, and the revolution in the government; and it appears to have assumed this form, only a few days previous to Randolph's dismissal from the Scottish court. One only step remained: to communicate the plot to the queen of England and her ministers, and to obtain their approval and support. Randolph was now at Berwick with the Earl of Bedford, the lieutenant of the North, and from this place these persons wrote on the 6th of March to Elizabeth, informing her of "a matter of no small consequence being intended in Scotland," referring to a more particular statement which they had transmitted to Cecil, adding that Murray would thus

¹ St. P. Off. Copy by Randolph from the original:—"Conditions for the earls to perform to their king," and "Conditions to be performed by the King of Scots to the earls." Endorsed in Cecil's hand, *Primo Martii*, 1565.

be brought home ; that Tuesday was the last day, and that they looked daily to hear of its execution.¹

The other letter from Bedford and Randolph to Cecil, written on the same day, was far more explicit. It enjoined the strictest secrecy : they had promised, they said, upon their honour, that none except the Queen, Leicester, and Cecil himself, should be informed of “ the great attempt,” now on the eve of being put in execution ; and they went on thus to describe it :

“ The matter is this. Somewhat we are sure you have heard of divers discords and jarrers² between this queen and her husband, partly for that she hath refused him the crown matrimonial, partly for that he hath assured knowledge of such usage of herself, as altogether is intolerable to be borne, which, if it were not overwell known, we would both be very loath to think that it could be true. To take away this occasion of slander, he is himself determined to be at the apprehension and execution of him, whom he is able manifestly to charge with the crime, and to have done him the most dishonour that can be to any man, much more being as he is. We need not more plainly to describe the person. You have heard of the man whom we mean of.

“ To come by the other thing which he desireth, which is the crown matrimonial, what is devised and concluded upon by him and the noblemen; you

¹ MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Bedford and Randolph to the Queen. Berwick, March 6, 1565.

² Jars.

shall see by the copies of the conditions between them and him, of which Mr. Randolph assureth me to have seen the principals, and taken the copies written with his own hand.

“The time of execution and performance of these matters is before the parliament, as near as it is. To this determination of theirs, there are privy in Scotland these : Argile, Morton, Boyd, Ruthven, and Liddington. In England these : Murray, Rothes, Grange, myself, and the writer hereof. If persuasions to cause the queen to yield to these matters do no good, they purpose to proceed we know not in what sort. If she be able to make any power at home, she shall be withstood, and herself kept from all other counsel than her own nobility. If she seek any foreign support, the queen’s majesty, our sovereign shall be sought, and sued unto to accept his and their defence, with offers reasonable to her majesty’s contentment. These are the things which we thought and think to be of no small importance, and knowing them certainly intended, and concluded upon, thought it our duties to utter the same to you Mr. Secretary, to make declaration thereof as shall seem best to your wisdom. And of this matter thought to write conjunctly, though we came severally by knowledge, agreeing both, in one, in the substance of that which is determined. At Berwick, 6th March, 1565.¹

“F. BEDFORD. TH. RANDOLPHE.”

¹ MS. Letter, St. P. Off., March 6, 1565, Berwick. Earl of

I have given this long extract as the letter is of much importance, and has never before been known. It proves that Elizabeth received the most precise intimation of the intended murder of Riccio, that she was made fully acquainted with the determination to secure the person of the Scottish queen, and create a revolution in the government. Murray's share in the conspiracy, and his consent to the assassination of the foreign secretary, are established by the same letter beyond a doubt ; and we see the declared object of the plot was, to put an end to his banishment, to replace him in the power which he had lost, and by one decided and triumphant blow, to destroy the schemes which were in agitation for the re-establishment of the Roman Catholic religion in Scotland. It is of great moment to attend to the conduct of Elizabeth at this crisis. She knew all that was about to occur : the life of Riccio, the liberty—perhaps, too, the life—of Mary was in her hands ; Murray was at her court ; the conspirators were at her devotion ; they had given the fullest information to Randolph, that he might consult the queen : she might have imprisoned Murray, discomfited the plans of the conspirators, saved the life of the miserable victim who was marked for slaughter, and preserved Mary, to whom she professed a warm attachment, from captivity. All this might have been done, perhaps it

Bedford and Thomas Randolph, to Secretary Cecil, endorsed by Cecil's clerk, *Earl of Bedford and Mr. Randolph to my Mr.*

is not too much to say, that even in these dark times it would have been done by a monarch acutely alive to the common feelings of humanity. But Elizabeth adopted a very different course: she not only allowed Murray to leave her realm, she dismissed him with marks of the highest confidence and distinction, and this baron, when ready to set out for Scotland, to take his part in those dark transactions which soon after followed, sent his secretary, Wood, to acquaint Cecil with the most secret intentions of the conspirators.¹

Whilst these terrible designs were in preparation against her, some hints of approaching danger were conveyed to the Scottish queen; but she imprudently disregarded them. Riccio too received a mysterious caution from Damiot, an astrologer, whom he used to consult, and who bad him beware of the bastard, evidently alluding to George Douglas, the natural son of the Earl of Angus, and one of the chief conspirators; but he imagined that he pointed at Murray, then in banishment, and derided his apprehensions.² Meantime every thing was in readiness; a large concourse of the friends of the Reformed Church assembled at Edinburgh, for the week of fasting and humiliation: directions for prayer and sermons, had been previously drawn up by Knox and the ministers, and the subjects

¹ MS. Letter, St. P. Off., March 8, 1565. Newcastle, Murray to Cecil. See also MS. Letter, St. P. Off. B.C. Bedford to Cecil, Berwick, March 8, 1565. Also MS. letter, St. P. Off. Bedford and Randolph to Leicester and Cecil, Berwick, March 8th, 1565.

² Spotswood, p. 194.

chosen were such as seemed calculated to prepare the public mind for resistance, violence and bloodshed. They were selected from the Old Testament alone, and included, amongst other examples, the slaying of Oreb and Zeb, the cutting off the Benjamites, the fast of Esther, the hanging of Haman, inculcating the duty of inflicting swift and summary vengeance on all who persecuted the people of God.¹

On the 3rd of March the fast commenced in the capital, and on the 4th, parliament assembled. It was opened by the queen in person, and the lords of the Articles having been chosen, the statute of treason and forfeiture against Murray and the banished lords was prepared. This was on a Thursday; and on Tuesday, in the following week, the act was to be passed; but it was fearfully arrested in its progress.²

On Saturday evening, about seven o'clock, when it was dark, the Earls of Morton and Lindsay, with a hundred and fifty men bearing torches and weapons, occupied the court of the palace of Holyrood, seized the gates without resistance and closed them against all but their own friends. At this moment Mary was at supper in a small closet or cabinet, which entered from her bed chamber. She was attended by the countess of Argyle, the commendator of Holyrood, Beaton, master of the household,

¹ Knox pp. 340, 341, *Treatise on Fasting, &c.* a rare Tract. Edinburgh, 1565, Lekprivick. Kindly communicated to me by my friend, Mr. James Chalmers; and Goodall, vol. i. p. 248, 249.

² MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Bedford and Randolph to Leicester and Cecil. Berwick, 8th March, 1565-6. Ibid. B.C. Same to the Queen, 6th March, 1565-6.

Arthur Erskine, captain of the guard, and her secretary, Riccio. The bed chamber communicated by a secret turnpike-stair with the king's apartment below, to which the conspirators had been admitted; and Darnley ascending this stair, threw up the arras which concealed its opening in the wall, entered the little apartment where Mary sat, and casting his arm fondly round her waist, seated himself beside her at table. A minute had scarcely passed when Ruthven, clad in complete armour, abruptly broke in. This man had just risen from a sick bed, his features were sunk and pale from disease, his voice hollow, and his whole appearance haggard and terrible. Mary, who was now seven months gone with child, started up in terror, commanding him to be gone; but ere the words were uttered, torches gleamed in the outer room, a confused noise of voices and weapons was heard, and the next moment George Douglas, Car of Faudonside and other conspirators rushed into the closet¹. Ruthven now drew his dagger, and calling out that their business was with Riccio, made an effort to seize him, whilst this miserable victim springing behind the queen, clung by her gown, and in his broken language called out, "Giustizia, Giustizia, sauve ma vie, Madame, sauve ma vie."² All was now

¹ Mary to the Bishop of Glasgow, 2 April, 1566. Keith, 330; also Bedford and Randolph to the Council, 27 March, 1566. Ellis, vol. ii. 1st series, p. 207. Morton and Ruthven's Narrative. *Caligula*, B. ix. f. 298, more full than that in Keith, App. 120, which is a Copy.

² Birrel's Diary p. 5.

uproar and confusion ; and though Mary earnestly implored them to have mercy, they were deaf to her entreaties ; the table and lights were thrown down, Riccio was stabbed by Douglas over the queen's shoulder, Car of Faudonside, one of the most ferocious of the conspirators, held a pistol to her breast, and whilst she shrieked with terror, their bleeding victim was torn from her knees, and dragged amidst shouts and execrations through the queen's bed room, to the entrance of the presence chamber. Here Morton and his men rushed upon him, and buried their daggers in his body. So eager and reckless were they in their ferocity, that in the struggle to get at him, they wounded one another, nor did they think the work complete till the body was mangled by fifty-six wounds, and left in a pool of blood, with the king's dagger sticking in it, to show as was afterwards alleged, that he had sanctioned the murder.¹

Nothing can more strongly show the ferocious manners of the times than an incident which now occurred. Ruthven, faint from sickness, and reeking from the scene of blood, staggered into the queen's cabinet, where Mary still stood distracted

¹ Drury to Cecil, B.C. Berwick, 27 March, 1566, "David had 56 wounds, whereof 34 was in his back." "Such desire" says Drury, "was to have him surely and speedily slain, that in jabbing at him so many at once, as some bestowed their daggers where neither they meant it not, nor the receivers willing to have it ; as one can for his own good, now in this town (a follower to my lord Ruthven) be too true a testimony, who carries the bag in [on] his hand."

and in terror of her life. Here he threw himself upon a seat, called for a cup of wine, and being reproached for the cruelty of his conduct, not only vindicated himself and his associates, but plunged a new dagger into the heart of the unhappy queen, by declaring that her husband had advised the whole. She was then ignorant of the completion of the murder, but suddenly one of her ladies rushed into the room and cried out that their victim was slain. “And is it so,” said Mary, “then farewell tears, we must now think of revenge.”¹

Having finished the first act of this tragedy, the conspirators proceeded to follow out their preconcerted measures. The queen was kept a prisoner in her apartment, and strictly guarded. The king assuming the sole power, addressed his royal letters, dissolving the parliament, and commanding the Estates to leave the capital within three hours on pain of treason; orders were despatched to the magistrates, enjoining them with their city force to keep a vigilant watch, and suffer none but Protestants to leave their houses. And to Morton, the chancellor, with his armed retainers, was entrusted the guarding the gates of the palace, with strict injunction that none should escape from it.²

This, however, amid the tumult of a midnight murder, was not so easy a task. Huntley and Bothwell contrived to elude the guards. Sir James Balfour and James Melvil were equally fortunate; and

¹ Morton and Ruthven's Narrative ut supra. Spotswood, p. 195.

² Morton and Ruthven's Narrative, Keith, 126.

as this last gentleman passed beneath the queen's window, she threw up the sash and implored him to warn the citizens, to save her from the traitors who had her in their power : soon after the common bell was heard ringing, so speedily had the message been carried ; and the chief magistrate, with a body of armed townsmen, rushed confusedly into the palace court, demanding the instant deliverance of their sovereign. But Mary in vain implored to speak with them ; she was dragged back from the window by the ruffians, who threatened to cut her in pieces if she attempted to show herself ; and in her stead the pusillanimous Darnley was thrust forward. He addressed the citizens, assured them that both he and the queen were in safety, and, commanding them on their allegiance to go home, was instantly obeyed.¹

Thus ended all hope of rescue ; but although baffled in this attempt, secluded even from her women, trembling and justly fearing for her life, the queen's courage and presence of mind did not forsake her. She remonstrated with her husband ; she even condescended to reason with Ruthven, who replied in rude and upbraiding terms, and at last exhausted with this effort, she would have sunk down had they not called for her ladies and left her to repose. Next morning all the horrors of her condition broke fully upon her ; she was a prisoner, in the hands of a band of assassins ; they

¹ Mary to Archbishop Beaton, 2 April, 1565-6. Keith, 332. Melvil's Memoirs, 150.

were led by her husband, who watched all her motions ; he had already assumed the royal power, she was virtually dethroned ; who could tell what dark purposes might not be meditated against her person. These thoughts agitated her to excess, and threw her into a fever, in which she imagined the ferocious Ruthven was coming to murder her, and shrieking out that she was abandoned by all, she was threatened with miscarriage. The piteous sight revived Darnley's affection ; her gentlewomen were admitted, and the danger passed away, yet so strong was the suspicion with which she was guarded, that no lady was allowed to pass " muffled " from the queen's chamber.¹

It was now Sunday night, the murder had been committed late on Saturday evening ; and according to their previous concert, Murray, Rothes and Ochiltree, with others of the banished lords, arrived in the capital and instantly rode to the palace. They were welcomed by Darnley ; and so little did Mary suspect Murray's foreknowledge of the murder, that she instantly sent for him, and throwing herself into his arms in an agony of tears, exclaimed, " if my brother had been here he never would have suffered me to have been thus cruelly handled." The sight overcame him, and he is reported to have wept ; but, if sincere, his compunction was momentary, for, from the queen he repaired to Morton, and in a

¹ Morton and Ruthven's Narrative. Keith, Appendix, pp. 127, 128.

meeting with the whole conspirators, it was resolved to shut up their sovereign in Stirling Castle, to compel her to give the crown and the whole government of the realm to Darnley, and to confirm the Protestant religion, under the penalty of death or perpetual imprisonment.¹

Meanwhile, Mary's spirit and courage revived. She perceived that her influence over her husband was not at an end, and exerting those powers of fascination and persuasive language which she possessed in so high a degree, she succeeded in alarming his fears, and awakening his love. She represented to him, that he was surrendering himself a tool into the hands of her enemies and his own: if they had belied her honour, if they had periled her life, and that of his unborn infant, could he believe, that when he alone stood between them and their ambition, they would hesitate to destroy him. Already he might see they took the power into their own hands, and when he sent his servants to her, refused to admit them, and then the flagrant falsehood of accusing him as a party to so base a murder, a deed which had he really contemplated, (but this she was assured he never had) must cover him with infamy in the eyes of the country, and of the world. Their only safety lay in escaping together. If, said she, it is your wish, I am ready to forgive, even the bloody men whose atrocious act you have just witnessed.—Go and tell them so—but let them treat

¹ Mary to Beaton. Keith, p. 332.

me as a free queen, let them remove their guards, avoid the palace which they have polluted with blood, and I will sign a written pardon for them on the spot. Darnley was won by her arguments, and becoming terrified for the consequences of the murder, took refuge in falsehood, denied all connection with the conspiracy, and placed himself in the hands of Mary, with the same facility which had lately made him the slave of the conspirators. Ruthven and Morton, however, were not so easily deceived, and insisted that the queen meant only to betray them. The king replied, she was a true princess, that he would stake his life for her faith and honour,¹ and led the conspirators to her presence, where she heard their defence, assured them of her readiness to pardon, and sent them away to draw up a writing for their security. They did so, delivered the paper to Darnley, left the palace, removed the guards, and permitted the servants of the household to resume their charge. To lull suspicion, the queen retired to rest, and Ruthven and his associates deeming all safe, betook themselves to the house of Morton the chancellor, as we have seen, one of the chief actors in the murder—but at midnight Mary rose, threw herself upon a fleet horse, and accompanied only by the king and Arthur Erskine, fled to Dunbar. The news of her escape

¹ This assertion of Darnley, which gives a direct contradiction to the story of Mary's alleged passion for Riccio, rests on the evidence of Lord Ruthven, who was present.—See his narrative of the murder in Keith, Appendix, p. 128.

flew through the land, her nobles, Huntly, Athol, Bothwell, and multitudes of barons and gentlemen, crowded round her, and in the morning Morton, Ruthven, and the rest of the conspirators, awoke only to hear that their victim had eluded their grasp, that an army of her subjects had already assembled at Dunbar, and that the penalties of treason were suspended over their heads.

Mary thus escaped, and it is impossible to withhold our admiration of the coolness, judgment, and courage exhibited by a woman under the dreadful circumstances in which she was called upon to exert these qualities. If we blame her duplicity, let it be remembered, that her own life, and that of her infant, were in jeopardy, that there was nothing unreasonable in the idea that the ruffians who had torn her secretary from her knees, and murdered him in her chamber, might before many hours were over, be induced to repeat the deed upon herself. We may gather, indeed, from the dark and indefinite expressions of Randolph in describing the approaching assassination, that their intentions, if she resisted their wishes, vacillated between murder and perpetual captivity.

Once more free, the queen acted with her usual spirit and decision. Having regained her ascendancy over the king, she obtained from this weak prince a disclosure of the chief persons engaged in the conspiracy. It would appear, however, that Darnley concealed Murray's guilt, and only denounced Morton, Ruthven, and other associates.

Against them the queen took instant steps. She summoned her people to attend her in arms, directed a writ of treason to be issued against the Chancellor, Lethington, and their accomplices, and advanced at the head of a force of eight thousand men to the capital.¹ Aware of this, the conspirators fled with the utmost precipitation. Morton, Ruthven, Brunston, and Andrew Car, took instant refuge in England, others, scattered hither and thither, concealed themselves in their own country. Knox in great agony of spirit, and groaning over the Church and his flock, buried himself in the friendly recesses of Kyle, and Lethington hastened to gain the mountain fastnesses of Athol. It was remarkable that Craig, the colleague of Knox, did not leave the city.²

To the English queen, and her brother, the Earl of Murray, Mary had a more difficult part to act, whilst she felt equal embarrassment as to the degree of confidence to be given to the king. We have seen incontrovertible proof that Murray was a party to the murder, though not a perpetrator of it, that Elizabeth was accessory to the conspiracy, and that Darnley and his father Lennox were the original contrivers of the whole: but of all this

¹ Knox, p. 344, Hist.

² MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Randolph to Cecil, Berwick, 21 March, 1565. M'Crie's Life of Knox, p. 254. I quote from the new and excellent Edition of this work by Dr. Crichton. See also Knox's Prayer, dated 12th March 1565, subjoined to his Answer to Tyrie.

Mary at this moment was ignorant. Elizabeth on being informed of the outrage, expressed the deepest sympathy and indignation; Murray affected an equal abhorrence of every thing that had occurred. Darnley not only denounced his former friends, but busied himself in bringing them to justice. The queen, therefore, without renouncing her resolution to punish the murder with the utmost rigour, deemed it prudent in the first instance to secure the active assistance of Elizabeth, to strengthen her ties with France, and to promote a reconciliation amongst her nobility, many of whom were at feud with each other: Bothwell, who during the late disturbances had vigorously exerted himself for his sovereign, was the enemy of Murray and Lethington—Athol, with whom Lethington had taken refuge, was at variance with Argile, and the differences amongst the leading barons as usual extended their ramifications though all their retainers and dependants.

It says much for the judgment of the queen that her efforts to compose these fatal differences were successful. Murray and Bothwell were reconciled, Argile and Athol agreed to suspend their contests, and Mary seemed even disposed to pardon Morton, Lethington, and the principal conspirators, if the extension of mercy could have brought back peace and security to her kingdom.¹ But this intended leni-

¹ MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Randolph to Cecil, 2 April, 1566; and Ibid. Robert Melvil to Cecil, 3 April, 1566, Edinburgh.

ency only brought upon her more sorrow. Her weak and treacherous husband became alarmed, and more loudly denounced his late friends, who had murdered Riccio. This conduct enraged them to the utmost, and they retaliated by again accusing him in more distinct and positive terms than before of being the sole instigator and contriver of the murder. To prove this, they laid the "bands," or covenants before the queen, and the dreadful truth broke upon her in all its sickening and heart-rending force.¹ She now understood for the first time that the king was the principal conspirator against her, the defamer of her honour, the plotter against her liberty and her crown, the almost murderer of herself and her unborn child; he was convicted as a traitor and a liar, false to his own honour, false to her, false to his associates in crime. At this moment Mary must have felt, that to have leant upon a husband whom she could trust, might, amid the terrible plots with which she was surrounded, have been the means of saving herself and her crown; but on Darnley she could never lean again. Can we wonder that her heart was almost broken by the discovery—that, to use the words of Melvil, she should have loudly lamented the king's folly and unthankfulness, that she was compelled to withdraw from him all confidence, and in solitary bitterness to act entirely for herself.¹

But if such were the queen's feelings towards the

¹ MS. Letter, St. P. Off. April 4. Berwick. Randolph to Cecil.
"The queen hath now seen all the covenants and bands that

young king, those of the conspirators whom he had betrayed were of a sterner kind. Even in those flagitious days, there were sanctions, the disregard of which covered a man with infamy and contempt, and amongst these, one of the most sacred was fidelity to the written "bands" by which the feudal barons were bound to each other. To one of these Darnley, as we have seen, had become a principal—his fellow-conspirators had performed their promise: he had not only broken his and denied all accession to the plot, but had betrayed the principal actors, and meanly purchased his own safety by their destruction. The consequence was the utmost indignation, and a thirst for revenge upon the part of Morton, Murray, Lethington, and their associates, which there is reason to believe increased in intensity till it was assuaged only in his death. These feelings of indignation were not confined to the fugitive lords. Mary avoided his company, and forbade her friends to give him any countenance. She promoted Joseph Riccio, David's brother, who had arrived in the suite of Mauvissiere, the French ambassador, to the dangerous vacancy caused by the murder;¹ and at last became so impatient and passed between the king and the lords. And now findeth that his declaration before her and the Council, of his innocence of the death of David was false."

¹ MS. Letter, St. P. Office, B.C. Berwick, April 20, 1566. Drury to Cecil.—Also Same to same, B.C. Berwick, April 26, 1566. See also Sir Th. Hoby to Cecil. French Corr. St. P. Off. 29 April, 1566.

miserable under the ties by which she was bound to her husband, that she entertained the extraordinary design of retiring to France, and entrusting the government of her kingdom to a regency, composed of five of her principal lords, Murray, Mar, Huntly, Athol, and Bothwell.¹ Another scheme, which at this moment occupied her mind, was the possibility of obtaining a divorce, on which errand it was reported, she had sent a messenger, named Thornton, to Rome.²

Her feelings, however, though keen, were not bitter or lasting. As the period of her confinement drew near, her resentment softened towards the king. At this moment her mind had become haunted with the terror that Morton and his savage associates, whose hands were stained with the blood of Riccio, had determined to break in upon her, during her labour : but the assurances of the English queen, who sent her word that she had dismissed him from her dominions, (which was not strictly true) restored her to composure.³ Uncertain that she should survive her confinement, she called for her nobility, took measures regarding the government of the kingdom, made her will, became re-

¹ MS. Letter, copy, Lethington to Randolph, 27 April, 1565. Caligula, B. IX. f. 244.

² MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Berwick, April 25th, 1566, Randolph to Cecil.

³ MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Berwick, June 13, 1566, Randolph to Cecil. Also MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Edinburgh, July 4, 1566, Killigrew to Cecil.—Also MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Killigrew to Cecil, 24th June, 1566.

conciled to the king, and personally arranged every thing either for life or death.¹

On the 19th of June she was delivered of a prince in the Castle of Edinburgh, and immediately dispatched Sir James Melvil to carry the news to Elizabeth. The English queen received the intelligence with her usual duplicity. From Cecil, who saw her before Melvil was admitted, and whispered the unwelcome news in her ear as she was dancing at Greenwich, after supper, she could not conceal her feelings. All mirth was at an end, she sat down, leant her cheek on her hand, and then burst forth in lamentations to her ladies, that she was a barren stock, whilst the Queen of Scots was the mother of a fair son. When Melvil had audience next morning, every thing was serene. His tidings, she said, gave her the utmost joy, and had cured her of a fifteen days' sickness. She promised also, in reply to his urgent request, that there should be a speedy settlement of the question of the succession.²

Meanwhile Mary recovered, and assured of the continuance of amicable relations with England, applied herself with her usual energy to heal the dissensions amongst her nobles, to conduct internal tranquillity and to re-establish a firm government. The great difficulty was the conduct to be pursued with Morton and the banished lords; and the queen

¹ MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Berwick, Randolph to Cecil, 7 June, 1566.

² MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Killegrew to Cecil, 24 June, 1566. Melvil's Memoirs, Bannat. Ed. p. 161.

soon became convinced that she must sacrifice her own feelings and adopt a lenient course, if she wished to recover her power. Amongst her nobility there was no want of talents or energy; the difficulty was, to attach them to the Crown, to heal their feuds amongst themselves, to prevent their intrigues with England. So long as Lethington was in disgrace, and the murderers of Riccio were banished, these ends could not be gained. The queen, therefore, listened to the intercession of Murray, whom she now treated with great confidence. Lethington was reconciled to Bothwell, and pardoned; the lairds of Brunston, Ormiston, Hatton, and Calder, the leaders of the Church party, were received into favour, but Knox still continued in his retreat, and there appears to have been some special rigour manifested against him on the part of the queen.¹ Morton, the arch conspirator, with his assistants, Lindsay and Ruthven, were still proscribed, but Murray, Bothwell, Argyle, Athol, and Lethington, who now acted together, exerted themselves unremittingly to procure their restoration, and the queen, it was evident, began to think of permitting their return.²

This intended mercy enraged the young king, and appears to have driven him upon foolish and dangerous courses: as his opponents were mostly Protestants, he began to intrigue with the Romanists, and went so far as to write secretly to the

¹ M'Crie's *Life of Knox* p. 254.

² MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Foster to Cecil, Sept. 19, 1566.

Pope, arraigning the conduct of the queen, in delaying to restore the mass. When his letters were intercepted, and his practices discovered, he complained bitterly of the neglect into which he had fallen, affirmed that he had no share in the government, accused the nobles of a plot against his life, and at last formed the desperate resolution of leaving the kingdom, and remonstrating to foreign powers against the cruelty with which he was treated.¹ This mad project alarmed his father Lennox, who communicated his fears to the queen, and Mary made an earnest attempt to restore him to his duty. The interview and remonstrances to which this led, are of much importance, in estimating the dark charges afterwards brought against Mary, and we fortunately know the whole particulars from the Lords of the Council before whom it took place, and also from the French ambassador, de Croc, who was present. The queen, it appears, had at first affectionately, and in private, implored Darnley to disclose the causes of his grief. “The queen,” said the Lords of the Council, addressing the queen mother,² “condescended so far as to go and meet the king without the palace, and so conducted him into her own apartment, where he remained all night; and then her Majesty

¹ Monsr. De Croc's Letter to Arch. Beaton, printed by Keith, p. 345, from the original then in the Scots College, Paris.

² Lords of the Privy Council to the Queen Mother, Oct. 8, 1566. Keith, p. 347, being a translation from a copy then in the Scots College at Paris.

entered calmly with him upon the subject of his going abroad, that she might understand from himself the occasion of such a resolution. But he would by no means give or acknowledge that he **had any occasion offered him of discontent.** The Lords of the Council, being acquainted early next morning, that the king was just agoing to return to Stirling, they repaired to the queen's apartment, and no other persons being present, except their lordships and Monsieur de Croc, whom they prayed to assist with them, as being here on the part of your Majesty."

The occasion of their meeting together was then, with all humility and reverence due to their Majesties proposed, namely, to understand from the king, whether, according to advice imparted to the queen by the Earl of Lennox, he had formed a resolution to depart by sea out of the realm, and on what ground, and for what end. That if his resolution proceeded from some discontent, they were earnest to know what persons had afforded an occasion for the same? That if he could complain of any of the subjects of the realm, be they of what quality whatsoever, the fault should be immediately repaired to his satisfaction. "And here," they continued, "we did remonstrate to him, that his own honour, the queen's honour, the honour of us all were concerned; for if without just occasion ministered, he would retire from the place where he had received so much honour, and abandon the society of her, to whom he is so far obliged, that in order

to advance him she has humbled herself, and from being his sovereign had surrendered herself to be his wife; if he should act in this sort, the whole world would blame him as ingrate, regardless of the friendship the queen bore him, and utterly unworthy to possess the place to which she had exalted him. On the other hand, that if any just occasion had been given him, it behoved the same to be very important, since it inclined him to relinquish so beautiful a queen, and noble realm, and the same must have been afforded him either by the queen herself, or by us her ministers. As for us, we professed ourselves ready to do him all the justice he could demand. And for her Majesty, so far was she from ministering to him occasion of discontent, that, on the contrary, he had all the reason in the world to thank God for giving him so wise and virtuous a person, as she had showed herself in all her actions."

"Then her Majesty," so the letter goes, "was pleased to enter into the discourse, and spoke affectionately to him, beseeching him, that seeing he would not open his mind in private to her the last night, according to her most earnest request, he would at least be pleased to declare, before these lords, where she had offended him any thing. She likewise said, that she had a clear conscience, that in all her life she had done no action, which could any way prejudice either his or her own honour; but nevertheless, that as she might perhaps have given him offence without

design, she was willing to make amends as far as he should require, and therefore prayed him not to dissemble the occasion of his displeasure, if any he had, nor to spare her in the least matter. But though the queen and all others that were present, together with Monsieur de Croc, used all the interest they were able, to persuade him to open his mind, yet he would not at all own that he intended any voyage, or had any discontent, and declared freely that the queen had given him no occasion for any.”¹ Such is the account given of this important interview by the Lords of the Council; and Monsieur de Croc, in writing a week afterwards to the Archbishop of Glasgow, Mary’s ambassador in France, was equally explicit in describing the affectionate conduct of the queen, and the strange and wayward proceedings of Darnley. He then added this remarkable sentence. “It is in vain to imagine that he shall be able to raise any disturbance, for there is not one person in all this kingdom, from the highest to the lowest, that regards him any farther than is agreeable to the queen. And I never saw her Majesty so much beloved, esteemed, and honoured, nor so great a harmony amongst all her subjects as at present is, by her wise conduct; for I cannot perceive the smallest difference or division.”²

¹ Lords of the Privy Council to the Queen Mother, Keith, p. 347. The letter is dated Oct. 8, 1566.

² Letter from Monsr. de Croc to Archbishop Beaton, dated Oct. 15, 1566, published by Keith, p. 346, being a translation from the original then in the Scots College, Paris.

Yet neither the temperate conduct of the queen, the remonstrances of the Council, nor the neglect into which he found himself daily sinking, produced any amendment in Darnley. He persisted in his project of leaving the kingdom, denounced Lethington, the Justice Clerk, Bellenden, and Makgill the clerk register, as principal conspirators against Riccio, insisted that they should be deprived of their offices, and became an object of dislike and suspicion not only to Mary, but to all that powerful, and now united, party, by whom she was surrounded.¹ Its leaders Murray, Lethington, Argyle, and Bothwell, saw in him the bitter opponent of Morton's pardon. The faction of the church hated him for his intrigues with Rome,² Cecil and the party of Elizabeth suspected him of practices with the English Roman Catholics,³ the Hamiltons had always looked on him with dislike, as an obstacle between them and their hopes of succession, and the queen bitterly repented that she was tied to a wayward and intemperate person, who had already endangered her life and her crown, and was constantly thwarting every measure which promised the restoration of tranquillity and good government.

When such was the state of matters between the

¹ MS. Letter, St. P. Off. B.C. Foster to Cecil, May 16, 1566, Alnwick. Also MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Randolph to Cecil, May 13, 1566, Berwick.

² Knox's History, p. 348. Glasgow edition, by M'Gavin, 1832.

³ MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Rogers to Cecil, July 5, 1566, Oxford.

king and queen, disturbances broke out upon the borders, and rendered it necessary for Mary to repair in person to these districts, for the purpose of holding courts for the trial of delinquents.¹ Her lieutenant or warden of the borders at this time, was the Earl of Bothwell, and him she dispatched at the head of a considerable force, to reduce the Elliots, Armstrongs, and other offenders to something like subjection, before she herself repaired to the spot. So far as this task went, Bothwell was well fitted for it. He was of high rank, possessed a daring and martial spirit, and his unshaken attachment to her interests, at a time when the queen had suffered from the desertion of almost every other servant, made him a favourite with a princess who esteemed bravery and fidelity above all other virtues. But unfortunately for Mary, he possessed other and more dangerous qualities.² His ambition and audacity were unbounded. He was a man of notorious gallantry, and had spent a loose life on the Continent, from which it was said, he had imported some of its worst vices. In attaining the objects of his ambition, he was perfectly unscrupulous as to the means he employed, and he had generally about him a band of broken and desperate men, with whom his office of border warden made him familiar, hardened and murderous villains, who were ready on the moment to obey

¹ MS. Letter, St. P. Off. B.C. Scrope to Cecil, Carlisle, Oct. 6, 1566. Also Ibid. B.C. Same to the same, Oct. 8, 1566.

² MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Randolph to Cecil, Edin. Sep. 12, 1565.

every command of their master. In one respect Bothwell was certainly better than many of his brother nobles. There seems to have been little craft or hypocrisy about him, and he made no attempt to conceal his infirmities or vices under the cloak of religion. It is not unlikely, that for this reason, Mary, who had experienced his fidelity to the crown, was more disposed to trust him in any difficulty, than those stern and fanatical leaders, who, with religion on their lips, were often equally indifferent as to the means which they employed. It is certain, that from this time she began to treat him with great favour, and to be guided by a preference so predominant, that it was not unlikely to be mistaken for a more tender feeling. This partiality of the queen for Bothwell, was early detected by Murray, Lethington, and their associates: they observed that his vanity was flattered by the favour shown him by his sovereign, they artfully fanned the flame, and encouraged an ambition already daring enough, to aspire to a height which he had never dreamt of, and it is the opinion of Sir James Melvil, who spoke from personal observation, that Bothwell's plot for the murder of his sovereign, and the possession of the queen's person, had its origin about this time, when she despatched him to suppress the disturbances in Liddesdale.¹

¹ Melvil's Memoirs, pp. 170, 173. Melvil, who wrote probably from memory, erroneously places the baptism of the prince, before the skirmish in Liddesdale, when Bothwell was wounded.

After the singular scene before the privy council and the French ambassador, the king left the court, and the queen, accompanied by her ministers and the officers of her household, set out on her progress to the borders. At this moment, these districts were in a state of great disorder, a feud raged between the Armstrongs and the Johnstons, two of the fiercest and most numerous septs in that part of the country.¹ The arrival of Bothwell, the queen's lieutenant, with a commission to reduce them to obedience, rather increased the disturbances, and in an attempt to apprehend Elliot of Park, a notorious marauder, the earl was grievously wounded, and left for dead on the field. An account of the sanguinary skirmish in which this happened, was immediately sent by Lord Scrope to Secretary Cecil. "I have," said he, "presently gotten intelligence out of Scotland, that the Earl of Bothwell, being in Liddesdale for the apprehension of certain disordered persons there, had apprehended the lairds of Mangerton and Whitehaugh, with sundry other Armstrongs of their surname and kindred whom he had put within the Harmitage.² And yesterday, going about to take such like persons of the Elliotts, in pursuit of them his lordship being foremost, and far before his company, encountered one John Elliott of the Park, hand to hand, and shot

¹ MS. Letter, St. P. Off. B. C. Scrope to Cecil, Carlisle, Oct. 6, 1566.

² A strong castle in that district.

him through the thigh with a dag,¹ upon which wound the man feeling himself in peril of death, with a two-handed sword assailed the earl so cruelly, that he killed him 'ere he could get any rescue or succour of his men.'"² Bothwell, however, though severely wounded, was not slain as at first reported, but having revived, was carried off the field to his castle of the Harmitage.

This accident happened on the 7th of October, and on the next day the 8th, the queen arrived at Jedburgh, and opened her court.³ The proceedings against the various delinquents who were brought before it, occupied her uninterruptedly until the 15th, on which day she rode to the Harmitage, and visited the Earl of Bothwell, who lay there confined by his wounds. The object of the visit appears to have been to hold a conference with the earl on the state of that disturbed district of which he was the governor. Mary was accompanied by Murray and others of her officers, in whose presence she communicated with Bothwell: afterwards on the same day, she returned to Jedburgh;⁴ and Lord Scrope, who immediately informed Cecil of the visit, added the precise information, that she had remained two

¹ A pistol.

² MS. Letter. St. P. Off. B.C, Lord Scrope to Cecil, Carlisle, Oct. 8, 1566. Also MS. Letter, Ibid. Sir John Foster to Cecil, Oct. 23, 1566, Berwick.

³ Chalmers, vol. i. p. 190, 4to. edition.

⁴ Caligula, B. IV. 104 dorso.

hours at the castle, to Bothwell's great pleasure and contentment.¹

Such a visit was undoubtedly a flattering mark of regard paid by a sovereign to a subject, but he was of high rank and in high office, he had nearly lost his life in the execution of his duty, and he was a favourite with the queen.

Immediately after her return, Mary was seized with a dangerous fever, which ran its course with an alarming rapidity, and for ten days caused the physicians to despair of her life. Its origin was traced by some, to the fatigue of her long ride to the Harmitage, but her secretary Lethington, with greater probability, in a letter written to Beaton, the Scottish ambassador in France, ascribed her illness to distress of mind, occasioned by the cruel and ungrateful conduct of the king.² "The occasion of the queen's sickness," said he, "so far as I

"Sa majeste fut requise et conseillé d'aller visiter en une maison appellé Hermitage pour entendre de luy l'estat des affaires de pays de quel le dit Sieur (Bothwell) estait gouverneur hereditairement. Pour ceste occasion elle y alla en diligence accompagnée du Conte de Murray, et autres seigneurs, en presence desquelles elle communiqua avec le dit Sieur Compte, et s'en retourna le mesme jour à Jedwood ou le lendemain elle tomba malade * *

¹ Laing in his account of this visit, and the arguments he deduces from it, has implicitly adopted the mistakes of Buchanan, and derides the account of my grandfather in his vindication of Queen Mary, which is far nearer the truth than his own. The letter of Lord Scrope to Cecil, written at the moment, and not known to either of these authors, gives us the whole truth.

² Sloan MSS., British Museum, 3199, fol. 141. Lethington to Archbishop Beaton, Oct. 24, 1566.

can understand, is caused of thought and displeasure, and I trow by what I could wring further of her own declaration to me, the root of it is the king. For she has done him so great honour without the advice of her friends, and contrary to the advice of her subjects, and he, on the other hand, has recompensed her with such ingratitude, and misuses himself so far towards her, that it is a heartbreak to her, to think that he should be her husband, and how to be free of him she has no out-gait.”¹

During this alarming sickness, Mary believed herself dying, and an interesting account of her behaviour has come down to us from her confidential servants, who were present, Secretary Lethington, the Bishop of Ross, and the French ambassador de Croc. She expressed her entire resignation to the will of God, she exhorted her nobility in pathetic terms to remain in unity and peace with each other, employing their utmost diligence in the government of the kingdom and the education of her son ; she sent her affectionate remembrances by de Croc, to the French king and her relatives in that country, and declared her constant mind to die in the Roman Catholic religion.² To the great joy

¹ *Ibid.* Out-gait—way of getting out.

² Letter, Lesly, Bishop of Ross, to the Archbishop of Glasgow, Jedburgh, Oct. 27, 1566. Keith, Appendix, No. XIV. p. 134. Also MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Oct. 24, 1566, Lethington to Cecil ; also the Council to Archbishop Beaton, Oct. 23, 1566. Keith, Appendix, No. XIV. p. 133.

of those around her at this moment, she recovered, and although much weakened, proceeded in her progress to Kelso, and thence by Dunbar to Craigmillar, near Edinburgh.

But if there was a recovery of bodily health, there was no return to peace of mind. During the height of her illness, the king had never come to see her, and a visit which he made when the danger was past, produced no effect in removing their unhappy estrangement.¹ At this moment her condition, as described by an eye-witness, Monsieur de Croc, was pitiable and affecting. She seemed to have fallen into a profound melancholy. "The queen," said this ambassador, writing to the Archbishop of Glasgow, on the 2nd December, "is for the present at Craigmillar, about a league distant from this city. She is in the hands of the physicians, and I do assure you is not at all well, and I do believe the principal part of her disease to consist of a deep grief and sorrow. Nor does it seem possible to make her forget the same. Still she repeats these words, 'I could wish to be dead.' You know very well, that the injury she has received is exceeding great, and her majesty will never forget it. The king her husband came to visit her at Jedburgh, the very day after Captain Hay went away. He remained there but one single night, and yet in that short time I had a great deal of conversation with him. He returned to see the queen about five or

¹ Extract in Keith, p. 352, from a letter of de Croc, dated 24 October, 1566.

six days ago ; and the day before yesterday he sent word to desire me to speak with him half a league from this, which I complied with and found that things go still worse and worse. I think he intends to go away to-morrow, but in any event, I am much assured as I have always been, that he won't be present at the baptism. To speak my mind freely to you (but I beg you not to disclose what I say in any place, that may turn to my prejudice), I do not expect, upon several accounts, any good understanding between them, unless God effectually put to his hand. I shall only name two. The first reason is, the king will never humble himself as he ought : the other is, the queen can't perceive any one nobleman speaking with the king, but presently she suspects some contrivance among them."¹

At this moment, when matters between the king and queen were in so miserable a state, the faction opposed to Darnley, which was led by Murray, Lethington and Bothwell, held a consultation with Huntly and Argyle, at Craigmillar, and there proposed a scheme to Mary for putting an end to her sorrows. This was, to unite their efforts to procure a divorce between her and her husband, stipulating as a preliminary that she should pardon the Earl of Morton and his accomplices in the murder of Riccio. When their design was first intimated by

¹ Translation by Keith, from part of an original letter of Monsieur de Croc, dated 2 December, 1566, preserved at that time amongst the MSS. of the Scots College at Paris. Keith, p. 7 of his Prefatory matter.

these noblemen to the queen, she professed her willingness to consent to it, under the conditions that the process of divorce should be legal, and that its effect should not prejudice the rights of her son. It was remarked that after the divorce Darnley had better live in a remote part of the country, at a distance from the queen, or retire to France. Upon which Mary relenting, drew back from the proposal, expressed a hope that he might return to a better mind, and professed her own willingness to pass into France and remain there till he acknowledged his faults. To this Maitland, the secretary, made this remarkable reply, hinting darkly, that rather than subject their queen to such an indignity as retiring from her kingdom, it would be better to substitute murder for divorce, “Madam,” said he, “soucey † ye not we are here of the principal of your grace’s nobility and council, that shall not find the mean¹ well to make your majesty quit of him, without prejudice of your son; and albeit, that my lord of Murray here present, be little less scrupulous for a Protestant nor [than] your grace is for a Papist, I am assured he will look through his fingers thereto, and will behold our doings, and say nothing thereto.”² This speech alarmed the queen, who instantly replied, that it was her pleasure nothing should be done by which any spot might be laid upon her honour; “better,” said she, “permit the matter remain in the state it is, abiding

¹ In orig. the *moyen*.

² Anderson’s Collections, vol. iv. p. 192; and contemporary copy, St. P. Off. [† French, mind ye not, *se soucier*.]

till God in his goodness put remedy thereto, [than] that ye believing to do me service may possibly turn to my hurt or displeasure." To this Lethington replied, "Madam, let us to guide the business among us, and your grace shall see nothing but good, and approved by parliament."¹

Such was this extraordinary conversation, and it is certainly difficult to determine its precise import. It appears to me that the first part alluded solely to the divorce, and that the second proposition hinted at the murder, though darkly, yet in terms which could scarcely have been misunderstood by any who were present.² It is certain that the queen commanded Murray, Bothwell, and their associates to abandon all thoughts of any such design; but it had been glanced at, she was put upon her guard, and difficult or impossible as it might have been, at once to dismiss these leading nobles from her councils, precautions might have been taken to defeat their abominable purpose. It is possible, however, that Mary considered her express command sufficient.

This, however, was but a feeble barrier in these cruel times. The conspiracy proceeded, and in the usual fashion of the age, a band or agreement for the murder of Darnley was drawn up at

¹ Anderson's Collections, vol. iv. p. 188., from a copy. Cotton, MS. Brit. Mus. Caligula, C. I. f. 282. Protestation of the Earls of Huntly and Argile, touching the murder of the king of Scots. There is a contemporary copy, varying in a few words in the St. P. Office.

² Instructions and Articles, by the Lords Huntly, Argile, &c., to John Bishop of Ross, Robert Lord Boyd, &c. Goodall, vol. ii. p. 359.

Craigmillar, of which instrument Bothwell kept possession. It was said to have been written by James Balfour, afterwards president of the Supreme Court, and then a daring and profligate follower of this nobleman ; it was signed by Lethington, Huntly, Argile and Sir James Balfour ; it declared their resolution to cut off the king as a young fool and tyrant, who was an enemy to the nobility, and had conducted himself in an intolerable manner to the queen, and stipulated that according to feudal usage, they should all stand by each other and defend the deed as a measure of state, resolved on by the chief councillors of the realm, and necessary for the preservation of their own lives.¹

¹ The existence of a Bond for the murder of the king is proved by Ormiston's confession, (Pitcairn's Criminal Trials, p. 512,) who says he saw the Bond in Bothwell's hands, and describes its contents, affirming that it was signed by Huntly, Argile, Lethington and Sir James Balfour, and that Bothwell told him many more had promised their assistance. This contract was, he adds, devised by Sir James Balfour, and subscribed by them all a quarter of a year before the deed was done. Ormiston in another part of his confession, observes, that Bothwell broke to him the purpose for the murder on the Friday before ; and when he expressed reluctance to have any concern in it, he said, "Tush, Ormiston, ye need not take fear of this, for the whole lords have concluded the same lang syne, in Craigmillar, all that was there with the queen." The same Bond is minutely alluded to in a contemporary life of Mary, written in French, apparently by one of her domestics, who, although biassed, seems to have had good opportunities of observation. Caligula, B. IV. folio, 104 verso. See also Answer of Lord Herries at York to Murray's "Eik," or Additional Accusation. Goodall, Appendix, vol. ii. p. 212.

Soon after this, the Earl of Bedford arrived from England, to attend the baptism of the young prince ; and it was remarked, that although Bothwell was a Protestant, the arrangement of the ceremony was committed to him.¹ The Scottish queen had requested Elizabeth to be godmother to her son ; and this princess having appointed the countess of Argile to be her representative,² despatched Bedford with a font of gold, which she expressed some fear that the little prince might have overgrown. “ If you find it so,” said she, “ you may observe that our good sister has only to keep it for the next, or some such merry talk.”³

On the 17th of December, the baptism of the young prince took place with much magnificence at Stirling. The ceremony was performed according to the Roman Catholic ritual, by the Archbishop of St. Andrew’s, and the royal infant received the names of Charles James.⁴

Mary upon this occasion exerted herself to throw off the melancholy by which she was oppressed, and received the foreign ambassadors and her noble guests, with those winning and delightful manners,

¹ MS. Letter, St. P. Off. B. C. Sir John Foster to Cecil, December 11, 1566, Berwick.

² MS. St. P. Off. ult. October, 1566. Minute in Cecil’s hand, from the Queen’s Majesty to the Countess of Argile.

³ Instructions to Bedford, November 7, 1566, Caligula, B. X. 384.

⁴ Letter from De Croc to the Archbishop of Glasgow, Stirling, 23 December, 1566. Keith, p. 7, of his prefatory matter.

of which even her enemies felt the fascination ; but the secret grief that prayed upon her could not be concealed. “ The queen,” said de Croc, writing to Beaton the Scottish ambassador at the French court, “ behaved herself admirably well all the time of the baptism, and showed so much earnestness to entertain all the goodly company in the best manner, that this made her forget in a good measure her former ailments. But I am of the mind that she will give us some trouble as yet ; nor can I be brought to think otherwise so long as she continues so pensive and melancholy. She sent for me yesterday, and I found her laid on a bed weeping sore, and she complained of a grievous pain in her side.”¹

From the baptism of his son the king absented himself, although he was then living in the palace. The causes of this strange conduct were no doubt to be found in his sullen and jealous temper ; the coldness between him and the queen, and the ill-disguised hostility with which he was regarded by Bothwell, Murray, and the ruling party at court, who were now busy labouring for the recal of Morton, so recently Darnley’s associate in the murder of Riccio, but now his most bitter enemy. De Croc, the French ambassador, in his letter to Bishop Beaton, describing the baptism, observed that the king’s conduct at this time was so incurable, that no good could be expected of him. It is of importance to

¹ Keith, preface, p. 7. De Croc, to Beaton ; from the original in the Scottish College, Paris.

mark his expressions. "The king," said he, "had still given out that he would depart two days before the baptism, but when the time came on he made no sign of removing at all, only he still kept close within his own apartment. The very day of the baptism he sent three several times, desiring me either to come and see him or to appoint him an hour that he might come to me in my lodgings. So that I found myself obliged at last to signify to him, that seeing he was in no good correspondence with the queen, I had it in charge from the most Christian king, to have no conference with him. And I caused tell him likewise, that as it would not be very proper for him to come to my lodgings, because there was such a crowd of company there, so he might know that there were two passages to it; and if he should enter by the one, I should be constrained to go out by the other. His bad deportment is incurable, nor can there be any good expected from him, for several reasons, which I might tell you, was I present with you. I can't pretend to foretell how all may turn, but I will say, that matters cannot subsist long as they are, without being accompanied with sundry bad consequences."¹

It had long been evident that Mary's enmity to the Earl of Morton, and his associates, who had been banished for the murder of Riccio, was much softened; and soon after the baptism she consented to pardon them at the earnest intreaty of Murray,

¹ De Croc to Beaton, Stirling, December 23, 1566, quoted by Keith in his prefatory matter, p. 7.

Bothwell, and their associates.¹ She excepted indeed from this act of mercy two marked delinquents, George Douglas, who had stabbed Riccio over her shoulder, and Andrew Car of Faudonside, who had presented a pistol to her breast ; but Morton, Lindsay, Ruthven, and seventy-six other persons were pardoned ; and so highly did the king resent and dread their return, that he abruptly left the court and took up his residence with his father, Lennox, at Glasgow. Soon after this he was seized with a disease which threw out pustules over his body ; and a report arose that he had been poisoned. The rumour cannot excite wonder when we recollect the bond for the murder of the unhappy prince, which had been entered into at Craigmillar, and which its authors, who occupied the chief places about the queen, only awaited a safe opportunity to execute. But in the present case rumour spoke false, for the disease proved to be the small pox, and the queen immediately despatched her own physician to attend him.² It was impossible, however, that he should receive much sympathy, either from Mary or her ministers. His actions lately had been marked by continued perversity and weakness. Whilst the queen had been exerting herself for some months to reconcile her nobles, to secure the amity of England, and by a judicious extension of mercy to Morton and his friends, to restore

¹ Bedford to Cecil. Orig. St. P. Off. December 30, 1566.

² MS. letter, St. P. Off. Bedford to Cecil. Jan. 9, 1566, i. e. 1566-7.

tranquillity and peace to the country, Darnley appears to have been occupied with perpetual intrigues and plots. Not contented with his secret correspondence with Rome, and the Roman Catholics in England, he was reported to entertain a project for crowning the young prince and seizing the government; and he exhibited, with his father Lennox, a fixed resolution to thwart all the measures of the queen, and give her perpetual vexation and alarm.¹ In all these enterprises there was so much inconsistency and jealousy; so evident an inability to carry any plot into successful execution, and yet such a perverse desire to create mischief, that the queen, in addressing her ambassador in France at this moment, expressed herself towards him with much severity. "As for the king our husband," said she, "God knows always our part towards him; and his behaviour and thankfulness to us is equally well known to God and the world, especially our own indifferent subjects see it, and in their hearts we doubt not condemn the same. Always we perceive him occupied and busy enough to have inquiry of our doings, which God willing shall always be such as none shall have occasion to be offended with them, or to report of us any ways but honourably, however he, his father, and their fautors speak,

¹ Examination of William Rogers. Orig. St. P. Off. 16 January, 1566-7. Keith, p. 348, quoting Knox in note 6. Also Mary's letter to Beaton. January 20, 1566-7, in Keith's prefatory matter, p. 8.

which we know want no good will to make us have ado, if their power were equivalent to their minds. But God moderates their forces well enough, and takes the means of the execution of their pretences from them : for, as we believe, they shall find none or very few approvers of their councils and devices imagined to our displeasure and misliking.”¹

When this letter was written, the king, as we have seen, lay at Glasgow,² and much about the same time an incident occurred at Berwick, which appears to me to connect itself with the conspiracy, to which he soon after fell a victim. In Mary’s service there were two Italians, Joseph Riccio, and Joseph Lutyni. Joseph Riccio was brother to the unhappy secretary David. He had arrived in Scotland soon after his brother’s murder, and had been promoted by Mary to the office which it left vacant.³ All that we know regarding him is, that the queen treated him with favour, and Lennox, after the assassination of his son, the king, publicly named him as one of the murderers. Of Lutyni we know nothing, except that he was a gentleman in the queen’s household, and an intimate friend of Joseph Riccio. This Lutyni Mary

¹ Mary to Bishop Beaton, 20 January, *ut supra*.

² Bedford to Cecil. Berwick. Orig. St. P. Off. 9 Jan. 1566-7. “The estate of all things there (Scotland) is as it was wont to be, and the agreement between the queen and her husband, nothing amended, as you shall hear further when I come. The king is now at Glasgow with his father, and there lyeth full of the small pocks, to whom the queen hath sent her physician.”

³ MS. letter, St. P. Off. Randolph to Cecil. April 25, 1566.

now sent on a mission to France (6 Jan. 1566-7) but he had only reached Berwick, when she dispatched urgent letters, directing that he should be instantly apprehended, and brought back to Scotland, as he was a thief, and had absconded with money.¹ Sir William Drury, Marshal of Berwick, to whom these letters were addressed, on examining him, appears to have found upon his person, or some-way to have got possession of a letter written to him by his friend Joseph Riccio—and its contents convinced Drury that the Scottish queen dreaded the disclosure of some important secret of which Lutyni had possessed himself. Alluding to Mary's letter and the discrepancy between the slight reasons assigned for his apprehension, and her great anxiety to have him again in her hands, Drury observed to Cecil, "And therefore giveth me to think by that I can gather as well of the matter, as of the gentleman, that it is not it [the money] that the queen seeketh so much, as to recover his person, for I have learned the man had credit there, and now the queen mistrusteth lest he should offer his service here in England and thereby might with better occasion, utter something either prejudicial to her, or that she would be loath should be disclosed but to those she pleaseth."²

¹ Lutyni's passport is dated 6 Jan. 1566-7. Contemporary copy from Orig. St. P. Off. sent by Drury to Cecil, referred to in a MS. Letter, St. P. Off. B.C. dated Jan. 23, 1566, i. e. 1566-7. He was ordered to be arrested by a letter from Mary, dated Jan. 17, 1566-7. Transcript from Orig. St. P. Off. and copy of passport.

² MS. Letter, St. P. Off. B. C. Drury to Cecil, 23 January, 1566. Berwick.

Riccio's letter was certainly fitted to rouse these suspicions. He told Lutyni, that they were both vehemently blamed, that they were accused of acting a double part, and that Lutyni in particular, was railed at, as having been prying into the queen's private papers ; and he implored him when examined on his return, as he valued his own safety and his friend's life, to adhere to a certain story, which he (Riccio) had already told the queen. On interrogating Lutyni, Drury found him in the greatest alarm, affirming, that if he were sent back to Scotland, it would be to "a prepared death."¹ Upon this he consulted Cecil, and received orders not to deliver him up, but to detain him at Berwick. The whole circumstances are exceedingly obscure, but it appears to me certain from Riccio's letter, that Lutyni had become acquainted through him with some secret, the betrayal of which was a matter of life or death—that Mary suspected that he had stolen or read some of her private papers, that she had determined to examine him herself upon this point, and that every thing depended on his deceiving the queen on his return, by adhering to the tale which had been already told her. In what other way are we to understand these expressions of Riccio to Lutyni. ** Se voi dite cosi come vi mando sarete scusato, e io ancora. La Regina vi manda ci pigliare per parlar con voi, pigliate guardia a voi che voi la cognoscete pigliate guardia che non v'abuzzi delle sue parole come voi sapete bene ; e m'ha detto che vuol parlare a voi in segreto e pigliate guardia delli dire come vi ho

¹ MS. Letter, St. P. Off. B. C. Drury to Cecil, Feb. 7, 1566-7.

scritto, e non altramente, a fin che nostra parola si confronti l'una a l'altra, e ne voi ne io non saremo in pena nessuna, * * e vi prego di aver pietà di me, e non voler esser causa della mia morte.¹ When it is considered that at this moment Bothwell, Lethington and their accomplices had resolved on the king's death—when we recollect the conference at Craigmillar, in which they had hinted their intentions to the queen, and had been commanded by her to do nothing that would touch her honour, when we know that Bothwell who was at this time in the highest favour with Mary was the custodiar also of the written bond for the murder of Darnley, there appears to me to be a presumption that Joseph Riccio, who must have hated the king, as the principal assassin of his brother, had joined the plot, that his terrors arose out of his having revealed to Lutyni the conspiracy for Darnley's murder, and that the queen suspecting it, had resolved to secure his person. This, however, is only presumption, and the letter might relate to some other state secret. But we shall again meet with Lutyni and Riccio — and meanwhile I proceed to those dreadful scenes, which so soon followed the baptism of the prince and the pardon of the Earl of Morton.

When this nobleman returned in the beginning of January, 1566, from his banishment in

¹ See the whole Letter—Proofs and Illustrations, No. 2. It is in St. P. Off. Endorsed in Cecil's own hand, "Joseph Riccio, queen of Scots' Servant."

England, Darnley still lay in a weakly state of health, at Glasgow. On his road to Edinburgh, Morton took up his residence at Whittingham, the seat of Archibald Douglas, his near relative, and soon after was joined there by the Earl of Bothwell and secretary Lethington.¹ The object of this visit was immediately explained by Bothwell, who in presence of Archibald Douglas, acquainted him with their determination to murder the king, and added as an inducement for him to join the plot, that the queen had consented to his death. The atrocious proposal was declined by Morton, not influenced by any feelings of horror, which from his character, he was not likely to give way to, but on other grounds. He was unwilling, he said, to meddle with new troubles, when he had scarcely got rid of an old offence.² Archibald Douglas then earnestly exhorted him to join the plot, and Bothwell, in a second interview, to which Lethington was admitted, reiterated his arguments, and insisted that all was done at the queen's desire. Bring me then, said Morton, the queen's hand writ for a warrant, and you shall have my answer. Upon this, Douglas accompanied Lethington and Bothwell to Edinburgh, and soon after he received

¹ Morton to Cecil from Berwick. MS. Letter. St. P. Off. 10 Jan. 1566-7. MS. Letter B.C. Drury to Cecil, January 23, 1566-7. Morton arrived at Whittingham, some time between the 9th and the 23d of January.

² Morton's Confession in Bannatyne's Memorials, p. 317. Bannatyne Edition.

X an order from Lethington to return to Whittingham, and tell Morton that the queen would receive no speech of the matter appointed unto him.¹ Douglas complaining of the brevity and obscurity of this message, Lethington replied, that Morton would have no difficulty in comprehending it, and it appears to me certain, that it related to the same subject already talked of between them, the king's murder, and the written warrant which Morton had required from the queen.

These secret interviews and conversations, took place at Whittingham and Edinburgh in the latter part of the month of January, and on the 22nd of the same month, Mary set out on a visit to the king at Glasgow. Darnley was now partially recovered from his late sickness, but he had received some private intelligence of the plots against him. He was aware of the return of Morton, who regarded him as the cause of all his late sufferings, he knew that amongst his mortal enemies who had never forgiven him his desertion of them in the conspiracy against Riccio, were some of the highest nobility who now enjoyed the confidence of the queen. He had recently heard from one of his servants, that Mary had spoken of him with much severity,² and her visit, therefore, took him by surprise. Under this

¹ Morton's confession before his death. Printed in Bannatyne's Memorials, p. 318. Archibald Douglas's Letter to Queen Mary, April 1586. Printed from the Harleian, by Robertson. Appendix XLVII.

² Thomas Crawford's Deposition. MS. St. P. Off. Endorsed by Cecil, but without date.

feeling the king sent Crawford one of his gentlemen to meet the queen, with a message, excusing himself for not waiting upon her in person.¹ He was still infirm, he said, and did not presume to come to her until he knew her wishes, and was assured of the removal of her displeasure. To this Mary briefly replied, that there was no medicine against fear; and passing forward to Glasgow, came into Darnley's bedchamber, when after greeting, and some indifferent talk, the subjects which had estranged them from each other were introduced. Darnley professed a deep repentance for his errors, pleaded his youth, and the few friends he now had, and declared to her his unalterable affection. Mary reminded him of his complaints and suspicions, spoke against his foolish plan of leaving the kingdom, and recalled to his mind the "purpose of Hiegate," a name given to a plot which Darnley affirmed he had discovered, and of which he was himself to be the victim. The queen demanded who was his informer. He replied the Laird of Minto, who had told him that a letter was presented to her in Craigmillar, made by her own device, and subscribed by certain others who desired her to sign it, which she refused.² Darnley then added, that he would never think that she, who was his own proper flesh, would do him any hurt, and if any others should do it, they should buy it dear, unless

¹ Anderson, vol. iv., pp. 168, 169, and MS. St. P. Off. Thomas Crawford's deposition.

² Crawford's deposition, *ut supra*.

they took him sleeping. He observed, however, that he suspected none, and only entreated her to bear him company, and not as she was wont, to withdraw herself from him. Mary then told him, that as he was still little able to travel, she had brought a litter with her to carry him to Craigmillar, and he declared his readiness to accompany her, if she would consent that they should again live together at bed and board. She promised it should be as he had spoken, and gave him her hand, but added, that before this, he must be thoroughly cleansed of his sickness, which she trusted he shortly would be, as she intended to give him the bath at Craigmillar. The queen also requested him to conceal the promises which had now passed between them, as the suddenness of their agreement might give umbrage to some of the lords ; to which he replied, that he could see no reason why they should dislike it.

When Mary left him, Darnley called Crawford to him, and informing him fully of all that had passed at the interview, bade him communicate it to his father, the Earl of Lennox. He then asked him what he thought of the queen's taking him to Craigmillar? She treats your majesty, said Crawford, too like a prisoner. Why should you not be taken to one of your own houses in Edinburgh? It struck me much the same way, answered Darnley, and I have fears enough, but may God judge between us, I have her promise only to trust to ; but I have put myself in her hands, and I shall go with her, though she

should murder me.¹ It is from Crawford's evidence, taken on oath, which was afterwards produced, and still exists, endorsed by Cecil, that we learn these minute particulars, nor have I been able to discover any sufficient ground to doubt its truth.²

Soon after this interview, the queen carried her husband by slow journies, from Glasgow to Edinburgh, where she arrived on the last day of January.³ It had been at first intended as we have seen, that Darnley should have taken up his residence at Craigmillar, but this purpose was changed, and as the palace of Holyrood was judged from its low situation to be unhealthy, and little fitted for an invalid, the king was brought to a suburb called the Kirk of Field, a more remote and airy site, occupied by the town residence of the Duke of Chastelherault, and other buildings, and gardens. On their arrival here, the royal attendants were about to proceed to the duke's lodging as it was called, but on alighting, Mary informed them, that the

¹ MS. St. P. Off. Thomas Crawford's Deposition. Crawford, a gentleman of the Earl of Lennox, was examined on oath before the Commissioners at York, Dec. 9, 1568, and then produced a paper which he had written immediately after the conversations between himself and the queen, and king. Wherein he did write what had taken place as nearly word for word as his memory would serve him. Anderson, vol. iv. p. 169. This paper is the Deposition endorsed by Cecil, from which I have taken the narrative in the text.

² Cecil's Diary. Anderson, vol. ii., p. 271.

³ MS. Letter, St. P. Off. B. C. Drury to Cecil, Jan. 26, 1566-7. Cecil's Diary. Anderson, vol. ii., p. 272.

king's apartments were to be in an adjoining house, which stood beside the town wall, not far from a ruinous Dominican Monastery, called the Black Friars.¹ To this place she led Darnley, and making every allowance for the rudeness of the domestic accommodations of these times, it appears to have been an insecure and confined mansion.² Its proprietor was Robert Balfour, a brother of that Sir James Balfour, whom we have already known as the deviser of the bond for the murder, which was drawn up at Craigmillar, and then a dependant of Bothwell's. This earl, whose influence was now nearly supreme at court, had recently returned from Liddesdale, and when he understood that Mary and the king were on their road from Glasgow, he met them with his attendants, a short way from the capital, and accompanied the party to the Kirk of Field.³

At this moment the reconciliation between the queen and her husband seemed to be complete. She assiduously superintended every little detail which could add to his comfort. She treated him not only with attention but tenderness, passed much of the day in his society, and had a chamber prepared for herself immediately below his, where she slept.⁴ The king was partially re-

¹ Evidence of Thomas Nelson. Anderson, vol. iv., p. 165.

² See a minute description of it in the Deposition of Nelson, printed in Anderson. Vol. iv. p. 165.

³ MS. Letter, St. P. Off. B. C. Scrope to Cecil, Jan. 28, 1566, Carlisle.

⁴ Nelson's Evidence. Anderson, vol. iv., p. 166.

assured by these marks of affection. He knew that plots had been entertained against his life, and, as we have seen, suspected many of the nobles to be his enemies. Yet he trusted to the promises of the queen, and, no doubt, believed that if she remained beside him, they would find it impossible to accomplish their cruel purpose. But when he indulged these hopes, the miserable prince was on the very brink of destruction.

Since their recent meeting at Whittingham, Bothwell, Morton, Lethington, and Sir James Balfour, had fully determined on the murder. The Earls of Huntly, Argyle, and Caithness, Archibald Douglas, with the Archbishop of St. Andrew's, and many others of the leading lords and legal officers in the country had joined the conspiracy, and some who did not choose directly to share in the plot, deemed it dangerous or impolitic to reveal it. Of this neutral sort, the greatest was Murray, whom from the evidence that yet remains, it is impossible to believe ignorant of the resolutions of his friends, but whose superior sagacity enabled him to avoid any direct connection with the atrocious design which they now hurried on to its accomplishment.

On Sunday the 9th of February, Bastian, a foreigner belonging to the household of the queen, was to be married at Holyrood. The bride, was one of her favourite women, and Mary, to honour their union, had promised them a masque. The greatest part of that day, she passed with the king. They appeared to be on the most affectionate terms,

and she declared her intention of remaining all night at the Kirk of Field. It was at this moment, when Darnley and the queen were engaged in conversation, that Hay of Tallo, Hepburn of Bolton, and other ruffians whom Bothwell had hired for the purpose, secretly entered the chamber which was under the king's, and deposited on the floor a large quantity of gunpowder in bags. They then laid a train, which was connected with a "lunt," or slow match, and placed every thing in readiness for its being lighted. Some of them now hurried away, but two of the conspirators remained on the watch, and in the meantime Mary, who still sat with her husband in the upper-chamber, recollected her promise of giving the masque at Bastian's wedding, and taking farewell of Darnley, embraced him and left the house with her suite.¹

Soon after, the king retired to his bed-chamber. Since his illness there appeared to have been a great change in him. He had become more thoughtful, and thought had brought with it repentance of his former courses. He lamented there were few near him whom he could trust, and at times he would say, that he knew he should be slain, complaining that he was hardly dealt with, but from these sorrows he had sought refuge in religion, and it was remarked that on this night, his last in this world, he had repeated the 55th Psalm, which he would often read and sing.² After his

¹ Nelson's Evidence, Anderson, vol. iv., p. 167.

² MS. Letter, St. P. Off. B.C. Drury to Cecil, about 18th April, 1567.

devotion, he went to bed and fell asleep, Taylor, his page, being beside him in the same apartment. This was the moment seized by the murderers, who still lurked in the lower room, to complete their dreadful purpose, but their miserable victim was awakened by the noise of their false keys in the lock of his apartment, and rushing down in his shirt and pelisse, endeavoured to make his escape, but he was intercepted and strangled after a desperate resistance, his cries for mercy being heard by some women in the nearest house; the page was also strangled, and their bodies carried into a small orchard, without the garden wall, where they were found, the king in his shirt only, and the pelisse by his side.¹ Amid the conflicting stories of the ruffians who were executed, it is difficult to arrive at the whole truth? But no doubt rests on the part acted by Bothwell, the arch-conspirator. He had quitted the king's apartments with the queen, and joined the festivities in the palace, from which about midnight he stole away, changed his rich dress, and rejoined the murderers who waited for him at the Kirk of Field. His arrival was the signal to complete their purpose; the match was lighted, but burnt too slow for their breathless impatience, and they were stealing forward to examine it, when it took effect. A loud noise like the bursting of a thunder-cloud, awoke the sleeping city; the king's

¹ See the Account of M. de Moret. Appendix, No. 4. MS. Letter, S. P. Off. B. C. Drury to Cecil. Feb. 12, 1566-7. Ibid. Same to same, about 18th April, 1567.

house was torn in pieces and cast into the air, and the assassins, hurrying from the spot, under cover of the darkness regained the palace. Here Bothwell had scarcely undressed and gone to bed, when the cry arose in the city, that the Kirk of Field had been blown up, and the king murdered. The news flew quickly to Holyrood, and a servant rushing into his chamber imparted the dreadful tidings. He started up in well-feigned astonishment, and shouted "Treason!" He was joined next moment by Huntly, a brother conspirator, and immediately these two noblemen, with others belonging to the court, entered the queen's apartments, when Mary was made acquainted with the dreadful fate of her husband.¹ She was horror-struck, shut herself up in her bed-chamber, and seemed overwhelmed with sorrow.²

The murder had been committed on Monday, about two in the morning, and when day broke, multitudes crowded to examine the Kirk of Field. Any lengthened scrutiny, however, was not permitted, for Bothwell soon repaired to the spot with a guard, and the king's body was carried to a neighbouring house, where it lay till it was produced before the privy council. In the brief interval, however, it had been noted that the bodies

¹ Declaration of William Pourie. Anderson, vol. ii. p. 170.

² Examinations and Depositions of William Pourie, George Dalgleish, John Hay, younger of Talo, and John Hepburn of Bowton, concerning the murder of the king. Anderson, vol. ii., pp. 165, 192, inclusive.

both of Darnley and of his page, were unscathed by fire or powder, and that no blood wound appeared on either.¹

This gave rise to innumerable contradictory reports and conjectures, but all agreed, that instant inquiry promised the only hope of discovery, and men watched with intense interest, the conduct of the queen and her ministers. Two days, however, elapsed before any step was taken,² but on the Wednesday after the murder, a proclamation offered two thousand pounds reward, to any who would come forward with information; and scarce was this made public, when a paper was fixed during the night, on the door of the Tolbooth, or common prison. It denounced the Earl of Bothwell, Mr. James Balfour, and David Chambers, as guilty of the king's slaughter. Voices, too, were heard in the streets at dead of night, arraigning the same persons; and as the fate of the king had excited the deepest indignation in the people, Mary's friends looked with the utmost anxiety to the conduct she should pursue. To their mortification, it was anything but satisfactory. Instead of acting with that spirit, promptitude, and vigour which she had so recently exhibited under the most trying emergencies, she betrayed a deplorable apathy and remissness. After keeping her chamber for some days, she removed to the seat of Lord Seton, at

¹ MS. Letter, St. P. Off. B. C. Feb. 11, 1566-7. Enclosure by Drury to Cecil.

² MS. Letter, St. P. Off. B. C. Drury to Cecil, Feb. 12, 1566-7.

a short distance from the capital, accompanied by Bothwell, Argile, Huntly, the Archbishop of St. Andrew's, and Secretary Lethington.¹ On the preceding day, Darnley had been buried in the chapel of Holyrood, but with great privacy. None of the nobility attended the ceremony, and it was remarked, that, of the officers of state, the Justice Clerk Bellenden was alone present.²

Meantime, whilst the queen was at Seton, placards accusing Bothwell, were openly exposed in the capital. The first of these appeared on the 17th, another repeated the denunciation on the 19th, and on the succeeding day, the Earl of Lennox, father to the murdered king, commenced a correspondence with the queen, in which he implored her to apprehend the suspected persons, and to lose no time in investigating the circumstances of his son's slaughter.³ She replied that the placards contradicted each other, and that she was at a loss on which to proceed. He returned for answer, that the names of the persons suspected, were notorious to the world, and marvelled they should have been kept from her majesty's ears, but to prevent all mistakes, he should repeat them: the Earl Bothwell, Mr. James Balfour, Mr. David Cham-

¹ MS. Letter, St. P. Office. Drury to Cecil. Berwick, Feb. 17, 1566, i. e. 1566-7.

² Barrow's Diary, Chalmers, vol. ii., p. 556.

³ MS. Letter, St. P. Off. B. C. Drury to Cecil, Feb. 19, 1566-7, Berwick. Also Ibid. Same to same, Berwick, Feb. 28, 1566-7. Cabala, p. 126. Norris to Cecil. Anderson's Collections, vol. i., p. 40.

bers, and black Mr. John Spens were denounced, he said, in the first placard ; in the second, Signor Francis, Bastian, John de Bourdeaux, and Joseph, David's brother ; and he finally besought the queen in the most earnest and touching terms, to take order for their immediate apprehension. But he besought her in vain.¹ At the moment he was writing, Bothwell continued in high favour, and enjoyed the most familiar intercourse with Mary. Although the reports of his guilt as the principal assassin became daily stronger ; nay, as if to convince Lennox, that all remonstrances would be inefficacious, Sir James Balfour, the very man who was named as his fellow-murderer, was suffered to be at large.

It was at this time, that Lutyni the Italian, Joseph Riccio's companion, was sent back by Drury to the Queen of Scots. Riccio himself, as we have just seen, had been accused as one of the murderers of the king ; but that Lutyni's secret, of which Riccio so much dreaded the discovery, related to the plot, can only be conjectured. On his arrival, the queen did not see him (it was scarce a week after Darnley's death), but directed that he should be examined by Bothwell. This baron was apparently satisfied with the reasons which he gave for his flight, and after a courteous interview, permitted him to return to Berwick. The queen, at the same time, sent him a present of thirty crowns, and he soon after

¹ Anderson, vol. i., pp. 40, 44, 47, 48. Also Enclosure in MS. Letter. B.C. St. P. Off. Forster to Cecil, 28 February, 1566-7.

left the country, expressing the utmost satisfaction at his escape.¹

Had the queen entertained any serious idea of discovering the perpetrators of the murder, the steps to be pursued were neither dubious nor intricate. If she was afraid to seize the higher delinquents, it was at least no difficult matter to have apprehended and examined the persons who had provided the lodging in which the king was slain. The owner of the house Robert Balfour, was well known, her own servants who had been entrusted with the keys, and the king's domestics who had absented themselves before the explosion, or were preserved from its effects, were still on the spot, and might have been arrested and brought before the privy council.² But nothing of this kind took place, and in this interval of delay and apparent indecision, many persons from whom information might have been elicited, and some who were actually accused, took the opportunity of leaving the country. On the 19th of February, only ten days after the explosion, Sir W. Drury addressed an interesting letter to Cecil from Berwick, in which he men-

¹ Whether guilty or no, Lutyni had been so well tutored by his friend, that no suspicion was raised. It is evident, however, that fears were felt for him, as Drury had procured a promise from Mary and Lethington, that he should be dismissed in safety; and sent a gentleman of the garrison with him, to see that it was fulfilled. MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Drury to Cecil, B.C., Feb. 19, 1566-7. Same to same, B. C., Feb. 28, 1566-7.

² Laing, p. 52.

tioned that Dolu, the queen's treasurer, had arrived in that town with eight others, amongst whom was Bastian, one of those denounced in the placards. Francis the Italian steward, the same person whose name had been also publicly posted up as engaged in the murder, was expected, he added, to pass that way within a few days, and other Frenchmen had left Scotland by sea.¹

In the midst of these events, the Earl of Bothwell continued to have the chief direction of affairs, and to share with Lethington, Argile, and Huntly, the confidence of the queen. The Earls of Murray and Morton, who were absent from the capital at the time of the murder, showed no disposition to return, and Lennox, when requested by Mary to repair to court, dismissed her messenger without an answer.²

Meanwhile rumour was busy, and some particulars were talked of amongst the people, which, if any real solicitude on the subject had existed, might have still given a clue to trace the assassins. A smith was spoken of in a bill fastened on the Tron,³ who had furnished the false keys to the king's apartment, and who, on due security, promised to come forward and point out his employers.⁴ A person was said to be discovered in Edinburgh, from whom

¹ St. P. Off. B. C. Berwick. Drury to Cecil. Feb. 19, 1566-7. Ibid. Drury to Cecil, Berwick, Feb. 19, 1566-7.

² Ibid. Same to same, February 19, 1566-7.

³ A post in the public market, where goods were weighed.

⁴ MS. Letter, St. P. Off. B.C., Drury to Cecil, 28 Feb. 1566-7.

Sir J. Balfour had purchased a large quantity of powder, and other placards and drawings appeared, in which the queen herself and Bothwell were plainly pointed at. But the only effect produced by such intimations was to rouse this daring man to a passionate declaration of vengeance. Accompanied by fifty guards, he rode to the capital from Seton, and with furious oaths and gestures declared publicly, that if he knew who were the authors of the bills or drawings, he would "wash his hands in their blood."¹ It was remarked, that as he passed through the streets, his followers kept a jealous watch, and crowded round him as if they apprehended an attack, whilst he himself spoke to no one of whom he was not assured, without his hand on the hilt of his dagger. His deportment and fierce looks were much noted by the people, who began, at the same time, to express themselves openly and bitterly against the queen.² It was observed that Captain Cullen and his company were the guards nearest her person, and he was well known to be a sworn follower of Bothwell's; it was remarked, that whilst all inquiry into the murder appeared to be forgotten, an active investigation took place as to the authors of the placards,³ and minuter circumstances were noted, which seemed to argue a light and indifferent

¹ MS. Letter, St. P. Off. B. C. Drury to Cecil, Feb. 28, 1566-7. Berwick.

² MS. Letter, Drury to Cecil, February 28, 1566-7.

³ Keith, p. 374.

behaviour, at a time when her manner should have been especially circumspect and guarded. It did not escape attention, that scarce two weeks after her husband's death, whilst in the country and in the city all were still shocked at the late occurrences, and felt them as a stain on their national character, the Court at Seton was occupied in gay amusements. Mary and Bothwell would shoot at the butts against Huntly and Seton, and on one occasion after winning the match, they forced these lords to pay the forfeit in the shape of a dinner at Tranent.¹ On the evening of the day in which the earl had exhibited so much fury in the streets of the capital, two more placards were hung up. On the one were written the initials, M. R., with a hand holding a sword. On the other, Bothwell's initials, with a mallet painted above, an obscure allusion to the only wound found upon the unhappy prince, which appeared to have been given by a blunt instrument.

These symptoms of suspicion and dissatisfaction were not confined to the people. Movements began to be talked of amongst the nobles. It was reported that Murray and some friends had held a meeting at Dunkeld, where they were joined by Caithness, Athol, and Morton,² and as this nobleman had absented

¹ MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Drury to Cecil, Feb. 28, 1566-7.

² MS. Letter, St. P. Off. B. C. Drury to Cecil, Berwick, Feb. 28, 1566-7.

³ Ibid.

himself from court, and kept aloof amongst his dependents, the queen became at length convinced that something must be done to prevent a coalition against her, and to satisfy the people that she was determined to institute a public inquiry into the murder.

To this, indeed, she had been urged in the most solemn and earnest terms by Bishop Beaton, her ambassador at Paris. The day after Darnley's death, she had written to this prelate, giving a brief description of the late dreadful events, and lamenting that his affectionate warning to beware of some sudden danger had arrived too late. In his answer he had implored her to lose no time in prosecuting its authors and vindicating herself in the eyes of the world. He had even gone so far as to repeat the common opinion then current in France, that she was herself the principal cause of the king's death, and that nothing had been done without her consent. His expressions upon this point were very remarkable. "Of this deed, if I should write all that is spoken here, and also in England, of the miserable estate of [the] realm by the dishonour of the nobility, mistrust, and treason of your whole subjects, yea, that yourself is greatly and wrongously calumniated to be the motive principal of the whole, and all done by your command, I can conclude nothing besides that which your Majesty writes to me yourself, that since it hath pleased God to preserve you to take a rigorous vengeance

thereof, that rather than it be not actually taken, it appears to me better, in this world, that you had lost life and all.* * * Here it is needful that you show forth now, rather than ever before, the great virtue, magnanimity and constancy, which God has granted you, by whose grace I hope you shall overcome this most heavy envy and displeasure of the committing thereof, and preserve that reputation in all godliness which you have acquired long since, which can appear no ways more clearly than that you do such justice as the whole world may declare your innocence and give testimony for ever, of their treason that have committed, without fear of God or man, so cruel and ungodly a murder.”¹

This honest letter was written on the 8th of March, about a month after the king's murder, and on the same day Mary received a message of condolence and advice from Elizabeth. It was brought by Sir Henry Kyllgrew, who, on his arrival, after dining with Bothwell, Morton, Lethington, and Argyle (all of them, as was afterwards proved, participant in this cruel deed), was admitted to the queen. To see her face was impossible, for the chamber was dark, but, by her voice and manner, she seemed in profound grief; and not only assured the envoy of her desire to satisfy the Queen of England's wishes regarding

¹ Keith, Preface, p. 9. Extract from the Orig. in the Scottish College, Paris.

the treaty of Leith and the matters of the borders, but promised him that the Earl of Bothwell should be brought to a public trial.¹

During his stay in the capital, which lasted but a few days, Kylligrew found the people clamorous for inquiry into the assassination, which they regarded as a shame to the whole nation, whilst the preachers solemnly exhorted all men to prayer and repentance, and in their pulpits appealed to God, that he would be pleased “to reveal and revenge.”² Scarce, however, had this envoy departed, when the queen seemed to have forgotten her good resolutions, and, infatuated in her predilection for Bothwell, admitted him to greater power and favour than ever. The Earl of Mar was induced to give up the Castle of Edinburgh, and it was given to Bothwell. Morton, after a secret and midnight interview with his royal mistress, received the Castle of Tantallon and other lands which he had forfeited by his rebellion, and it was remarked, that in return for this, his whole power and interest were assured to Bothwell. The Castle of Blackness, the Inch, and the Superiority of Leith, were conferred on the same favourite, and so completely did he rule every thing at court, that Murray, although he judged it prudent to keep on friendly terms, became dis-

¹ MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Kylligrew to Cecil, 8th March, 1566-7. .
Also MS. Letter, St. P. Off. B.C. 30 March, 1567. Drury to Cecil.
Berwick.

² MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Kylligrew to Cecil, ut supra.

gusted with the inferior part he now acted, and requested permission to leave the kingdom.¹

In the midst of these transactions, it was observed that the queen was wretched. She attended a solemn dirge for the soul of her husband—and they who were near her on this occasion, remarked a melancholy change from her former health and beauty. Nor were these feelings likely to be soothed by the letters which she now received from France, in which the queen mother, and the cardinal, her uncle, addressed her with bitter reproaches, and declared, that if she failed to avenge the death of the king, their cousin, and to clear herself from the imputations brought against her, they would not only consider her as utterly disgraced, but become her enemies.²

Urged by these repeated appeals, she at last resolved that Bothwell should be brought to a public trial, but the circumstances which attended this tardy exhibition of justice were little calculated to justify her in the opinion of her people. He had now become so powerful by the favour of the crown, and the many offices conferred upon him, that it was evident as long as he remained at large and ruled every thing at court, no person dared be

¹ MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Drury to Cecil, B.C. 17th March, 1566-7. Same to same, 14th March, 1566-7. B.C. Same to same, B.C. 21st March, 1566-7. Same to same, 29th and 30th March, 1567. B.C. See also MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Drury to Cecil, 4th April, 1567.

² Drury's letter to Cecil. MS. Letter, St. P. Off. March 29th 1567, B.C.

so hardy as accuse him. His trial accordingly was little else than a mock ceremonial, directed by himself, and completely overruled by his creatures. The Earl of Lennox, who at an earlier period had in vain implored the queen to investigate the murder, and to collect, whilst it was attainable, such evidence as might bring the guilt home to its authors, now as earnestly and justly pleaded the necessity of delay. He had been summoned to appear and make good his accusation against Bothwell, but he declared that it was in vain to expect him to come singly, opposed to a powerful adversary, who enjoyed the royal favour, and commanded the town and the castle. He conjured the queen to grant him some time, that he might assemble his friends; he observed, that when the suspected persons were still at liberty, powerful at court, and about her majesty's person, no fair trial could take place, and when all was in vain, he applied to Elizabeth, who wrote to Mary in the strongest terms, and besought her, as she hoped to save herself from the worst suspicions, to listen to so just a request. It was forcibly urged by the English queen, that Lennox was well assured of a combination to acquit Bothwell, and to accomplish by force, what could never be attained by law; and she advised her, in the management of a cause which touched her so nearly, to use that sincerity and prudence which might convince the whole world, that she was guiltless.¹

¹ MS. Letter, St. P. Off. B.C. Drury to Cecil, 4th April 1567,

It is not certain that the Scottish queen received this letter in time to stay the proceedings, for it was only written four days previous to the trial, and the Provost Marshal of Berwick, to whom its delivery was entrusted, arrived at the capital early in the morning of the 12th of April, the very day on which the trial took place. The state in which he found the city, soon convinced him that his message would be fruitless. When he entered the palace, the friends of the Earl of Bothwell were assembled. They and their followers mustered four thousand men, besides a guard of two hundred hackbutters. This formidable force kept possession of the streets, and filled the outer court of the palace, and as the castle was at his devotion, it was evident that Bothwell completely commanded the town.

It was scarcely to be expected that a messenger whose errand was suspected to be a request for delay should be welcome, and although he announced himself to be bearer of a letter from Elizabeth, he was rudely treated, reproached as an English villain, who had come to stay the "assize,"¹ and assured that the queen was too busy with the matters of the day, to attend to other business. At that moment Bothwell himself, with the secretary Lethington, came out of the palace, and the Provost Marshal delivered the Queen of England's letters to the secretary, who, accompanied by Bothwell, carried them to

¹ The trial by a jury.—MS. Letter, St. P. Off. B.C. 15th April, 1567. Berwick. Drury to Cecil.

Mary. No answer, however, was brought back, and after a short interval, the earl and the secretary again came out, and mounted their horses, when he eagerly pressed forward for his answer. Lethington then assured him that his royal mistress was asleep, and could not receive the letter; but the excuse was hardly uttered, before it was proved to be false, for at this moment, a servant of de Croc, the French ambassador, who stood beside the English envoy, looking up, saw, and pointed out the queen and Mary Fleming, wife of the secretary, standing at a window of the palace; nor did it escape their notice, that as Bothwell rode past, Mary gave him a friendly greeting for a farewell. The cavalcade then left the court, and proceeded to the Tolbooth, where the trial was to take place, Bothwell's hackbutter surrounding the door, and permitting none to enter who were suspected of being unfavourable to the accused.¹

From the previous preparations, the result of such a trial might have been anticipated with certainty. The whole proceedings had already been arranged in a council, held some little time before, in which Bothwell had taken his seat, and given directions regarding his own arraignment.² The jury consisted principally, if not wholly, of the favourers of the earl; the law officers of the crown were

¹ MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Drury to Cecil. April 15th, 1567. Berwick, B.C. Also a fragment, MS. Letter. St. P. Off. undated. Drury to Cecil, April, 1567.

² Anderson's Collections, vol. i. p. 50.

either in his interest, or overawed into silence, no witnesses were summoned, the indictment was framed with a flaw too manifest to be accidental, and his accuser, the Earl of Lennox, who was on his road to the city, surrounded by a large force of his friends, had received an order not to enter the town with more than six in his company.¹ All this showed too manifestly what was intended, and Lennox as might have been anticipated, declined to come forward in person. When summoned to make good his accusation, a gentleman named Cunningham appeared, and stated, that he had been sent by the earl his master to reiterate the charge of murder, but to request delay, as his friends who had intended to have accompanied him both for his honour and security had changed their resolution.² On this being refused to Lennox's envoy, he publicly protested against the validity of any sentence of acquittal, and withdrew. The jury were then chosen, the earl pleaded not guilty, and in the absence of all evidence, a unanimous verdict of acquittal was pronounced. Bothwell then by a public cartel challenged any gentleman who should still brand him with the murder. On hearing of this defiance, Sir William Drury requested Cecil to intercede with Elizabeth that he might be permitted to accept it, professing himself absolutely convinced of the earl's guilt, and next day a paper

¹ Anderson, vol. ii. p. 98. MS. Letter. St. P. Off. B.C. Forster to Cecil, 15 April, 1567. MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Drury to Cecil, 15 April, 1567.

² MS. Letter, St. P. Off. B.C. Sir John Forster to Cecil. 15th April, 1567, Alnwick. Anderson's Collections, vol. ii. p. 107.

was set up, declaring that if a day were fixed, a gentleman should appear—but as no name was given the matter dropped.¹

It was evident to all the world, that this famous trial was collusive, nor could it well be otherwise; Argile, Morton, Huntly, and Lethington, were all more or less participant in the king's murder, they were the sworn and leagued friends of Bothwell, and they conducted the whole proceedings. It has been argued by Mary's advocates, that she was a passive instrument in the hands of this faction, and could not, even if willing, have insisted on a fair trial. But, however anxious to lean to every presumption in favour of innocence, I have discovered no proofs of this servitude, and such imbecility appears to me inconsistent with the vigour, decision, and courage which were striking features in her character.

The acquittal, although countenanced by the nobles, was loudly reprobated by the common people, and as rumours began to rise of a divorce between Bothwell and his countess, a sister of Huntly, their indignation and disgust were strongly expressed. Even in the public streets, and in the queen's presence, these feelings betrayed themselves, and the market women, as Mary passed, would cry out, "God preserve your grace, if you are sackless² of the king's death." It was

¹ MS. Letter, St. P. Off. a fragment. Drury to Cecil. April 1567. Anderson's Collections, vol. ii. p. 158.

² Sackless, innocent.

noted too, that this daring man had insulted the general feeling by riding to his trial on Darnley's favourite horse, it was reported to Drury that the queen had sent him a token and message during the proceedings,¹ and every thing must have united to show Mary that her late conduct was viewed with the utmost sorrow and indignation. Yet, instead of opening her eyes to the perils of her situation, she seems to have resigned herself to the influence of one strong and engrossing passion, and her history at this moment hurried forward with something so like an irresistible fatality, as to make it currently reported amongst the people that Bothwell was dealing in love philtres, and had employed the sorceries of his old paramour, the lady Buccleugh.

Immediately after the trial Parliament assembled, and the queen, irritated, perhaps, at the open censures of the city, declined the ancient custom of being guarded by the magistrates and trained bands, preferring a company of hackbutter. The acquittal of Bothwell was then confirmed by the three estates, the conduct of the jury was approved of, the estates of Huntly and his friends restored, a rigid inquiry instituted against the authors of all bills in which Bothwell had been accused: and, as if to complete his triumph, Mary now selected him to bear the crown and sceptre before her when she

¹ Drury to Cecil. MS. Letter, St. P. Off. B.C. 10th April 1567 and April 19th 1567. Also April 1567.—No date of the day is given, but the month is certain.

rode to parliament.¹ It is worthy of remark also, that in this same parliament the Roman Catholic partialities of the queen seemed to be modified; and it is by no means improbable, that owing to the influence of Bothwell, who was a Protestant, the reformed party were treated with greater favour than before. Mary willingly agreed to abolish all laws affecting the lives of her subjects, on the score of their religion, she passed an act securing a provision to the poorer ministers; and it is likely more would have been granted if their assembly had refrained from recommending a rigid enquiry into the king's murder, which she resented and declined.²

So completely did she espouse the cause of her profligate favourite, that although all already dreaded his power, he now received from her the lordship and castle of Dunbar, with an enlargement of his office of High Admiral, and it was evident, that by the favour of the crown, and his "Bands" with the greater nobles, he had shot up to a strength which none would dare to resist.³ Murray, from his power and popularity was the only man who could have opposed him, but he now shunned the contest. We have already seen, that he had abstained from implicating himself in

¹ Keith, p. 378.

² MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Sir W. Kirkaldy to Bedford, 20th, April, 1567. Ibid. MS. Letter, Same to same, 8 May 1567.

³ MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Drury to Cecil, B. C. April 19, 1567; also Same to same, April 27th, 1567.

the Bond for the king's murder: the very day that preceded it, he had left the capital; since that time he seldom attended the meetings of the council, and shortly previous to the trial, with the queen's permission, he retired to France.¹ The friends, indeed, with whom he had long and intimately acted, Morton, Argile, Huntly, Lethington, and their associates, were all of them conspirators in the king's death;² and they now appeared firm adherents of Bothwell; but, in the meantime, it is certain, that for some time all open intercourse between them and Murray was suspended.

After his departure the events of every day exhibited some new proofs of the infatuated predilection of the queen. Happy had it been for this unfortunate princess, had she listened for a moment to the calm and earnest advice of her ambassador, at the court of France, when he implored her to punish her husband's murderers, and warned her in such solemn terms, that the eyes of Europe were fixed upon her conduct; but his letter appears to have made little impression; the collusive trial of Bothwell gave a shock to her best friends, and the extraordinary events which now rapidly succeeded confirmed the worst suspicions of her enemies.

On the evening of the day on which the parliament rose (April 19), Bothwell invited the principal nobility to supper, in a tavern kept by a person named

¹ MS. Letter, St. P. Off. B. C. Drury to Cecil, April 9 and 10, 1567.

² This was afterwards clearly established.

Ansley. They sat drinking till a late hour ; and during the entertainment a band of two hundred hackbutterers surrounded the house and overawed its inmates.¹ The earl then rose and proposed his marriage with the queen, affirming that he had gained her consent, and even (it is said) producing her written warrant, empowering him to propose the matter to her nobility. Of the guests some were his sworn friends, others were terrified and irresolute ; and in the confusion one nobleman, the Earl of Eglinton, contrived to make his escape ; but the rest, both Papist and Protestant, were overawed into compliance, and affixed their signatures to a Bond, in which they declared their conviction of Bothwell's innocence, and recommended " this noble and mighty lord " as a suitable husband for the queen, whose continuance in solitary widowhood they declared was injurious to the interests of the commonwealth. The most influential persons who signed this disgraceful instrument were the Earls of Morton, Argyle, Huntly, Cassillis, Sutherland, Glencairn, Rothes, and Caithness ; and of the lords, Herries, Hume, Boyd, Seton and Sinclair.²

The perfection to which the system of paid informers was now carried in Scotland, and the rapid

¹ Anderson, vol. iv. p. 60. Elizabeth's Commissioners to the Queen, 11th October, 1568, from Caligula, C. I. fol. 198.

² Anderson, vol. i. p. 107, from a copy in the Cottonian Library. Caligula, C. I. fol. 1. Keith, p. 381. There is a contemporary copy of the Bond in the St. P. Office, it is dated April 19, 1567, and bears this endorsement in Randolph's hand, " Upon this was grounded the accusation of the Earl Morton."

communication of secret intelligence to England and the continent, have been already frequently remarked in the course of this history ; but at no time did Elizabeth possess more certain information than at the present. She knew and watched with intent interest every step taken by Mary ; her far-reaching and sagacious eye had, it is probable, already detected the ruin of her beautiful and envied rival, in that career of passion upon which it was now too apparent to all, that she had entered ; and her ministers, Cecil and Bedford, who managed the affairs of Scotland, availed themselves with indefatigable assiduity of every possible source of information. Nor did they want assistants in that country, where a party was now secretly organising for the protection of the prince and the government, against the audacious designs of Bothwell.

Of this confederacy the most powerful at this moment were Argyle, Athol, Morton, and Sir William Kirkaldy, or, as he was commonly called, the Laird of Grange, a person of great influence, reputed the best military leader in Scotland, intimately acquainted with the politics of England and the continent, and, as we have already seen, strongly attached to the Protestant cause. The audacity and success of Bothwell naturally roused such a man, and all who professed the same principles ; they justly believed, that he who had murdered the father would have little scruple in removing the son ; they were aware of the infa-

mous Bond for the queen's marriage, some of them indeed had signed it, and they asserted that the unhappy princess, who should have watched over the preservation of her child, was no longer mistress of her own actions. To declare themselves prematurely, would have been ruin, considering the power of their opponent; they therefore secretly collected their strength, and gave warning to their friends, but determined to take no open step till they had consulted the wishes of Elizabeth.

For this purpose Grange addressed a letter to the Earl of Bedford on the day after Ansley's supper. He informed him of the miserable servitude of the nobles, and the infatuation of the queen, but assured her in strong terms, that even now, if Elizabeth would assist him and his friends, the murder of their sovereign should not long be unavenged. He enlarged on the imminent danger of the prince, and predicted Mary's speedy marriage to Bothwell, of whom he added, she had become so shamelessly enamoured that she had been heard to say, "she cared not to lose France, England, and her own country, for him, and shall go with him to the world's end in a white petticoat, before she leave him." He concluded his letter in these severe words, "Whatever is dishonest reigns presently in our court; God deliver them from their evil."¹

This letter from Grange was soon after followed by a still more remarkable anonymous communi-

¹ MS. Letter, St. P. Office, B. C. Grange to Bedford, 20 April, 1567.

cation. Whilst Mary and Bothwell believed their secret plans were safe, their confidential agents had betrayed them to this informer, by whom instant intelligence was sent to England, that the Countess of Bothwell, Huntly's sister, was about to divorce the earl; and that the queen had projected with her favourite, that seizure of her person, in which she was to be carried with a show of violence to Dunbar. The letter which was probably addressed to Cecil, is too remarkable to be omitted.

“ This is to advertise you, that the Earl Bothwell's wife is going to part with her husband; and a great part of our lords have subscribed the marriage between the queen and him. The queen rode to Stirling this last Monday and returns this Thursday. I doubt not but you have heard how the Earl of Bothwell has gathered many of his friends, and, as some say, to ride in Liddesdale, but I believe it is not, for he is minded to meet the queen this day called Thursday, and to take her by the way and bring her to Dunbar. Judge you gif¹ it be with her will or no? but you will hear at more length on Friday or Saturday, if you will find it good that I continue in writing as occasion serves. I wald ye reif this² after the reading; this bearer knows nothing of this matter. There is no other thing presently to write of; but after all you will please receive my heartly commendations by him

¹ If.

² “ I would have you tear this.”

that is your's, that took you by the hand. At midnight."¹

The intelligence given in this letter proved true. Mary, on Monday, the 21st April, repaired to Stirling to visit the prince, her son, and was much offended with the Earl of Mar, his governor, who, from some suspicion which he entertained, refused to allow the queen to enter the royal apartments with more than two of her ladies.² In the mean season Bothwell had assembled his friends to the number of eight hundred spears, and meeting her at Almond Bridge, six miles from Edinburgh, he suddenly surrounded her attendants, and with a show of violence conducted her to Dunbar, his own castle, which he had prepared for her reception.³ In the royal cavalcade thus surprised, were Lethington, Huntly, Sir James Melvil, and some others. The three last were carried prisoners to Dunbar with the queen, the rest were suffered to pursue their journey, but when Melvil remonstrated against such usage, he was informed by Captain Blacater, a confidential servant of Bothwell, that all had been done with the queen's own consent.⁴ And it cannot

¹ MS. Letter, St. P. Office; this Letter, though undated, contains internal proof that it was written on Thursday, the 24th April, at midnight, the day Bothwell carried off the queen to Dunbar. Cecil's Journal in Anderson, vol. ii. p. 275. Keith, p. 383.

² MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Drury to Cecil, B.C. 27 April, 1567.

³ MS. Letter, St. P. Off. B. C. Drury to Cecil, 27 April, 1567. Ibid. Same to same, B. C. 25 April, 1567. Ibid. B. C. Same to same, 30 April, 1567.

⁴ Melvil's Memoirs, p. 80.

be denied that every thing which now happened seemed strongly to confirm this assertion.

On the 26th of April, only two days after the event, Grange addressed this indignant letter to Bedford :

“ This queen will never cease unto such time as she have wrecked all the honest men of this realm. She was minded to cause Bothwell ravish her¹, to the end that she may the sooner end the marriage whilk she promised before she caused Bothwell murder her husband. There is many that would revenge the murder, but they fear your mistress. I am so suted to for to enterprise the revenge, that I must either take it upon hand, or else I man² leave the country, the whilk³ I am determined to do, if I can obtain license, but Bothwell is minded to cut me off, if he may, ere I obtain it, and is returned out of Stirling to Edinburgh. She minds hereafter to take the prince out of the Earl of Mar’s hands, and put him in his hands that murdered his father, as I writ in my last. I pray your lordship let me know what your mistress will do, for if we will seek France, we may find favour at their hands, but I would rather persuade to lean to England. This meckle⁴ in haste from my house, the 26th of April.⁵

¹ Used here in the sense of forcibly to seize—*rapio*.

² Must.

³ Which.

⁴ Much.

⁵ MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Copy of the time, backed in the handwriting of Cecil’s clerk, “Copy of the Laird of Grange’s letter to the Earl of Bedford.”

Mary was now swept forward by the current of a blind and infatuated passion. A divorce between Bothwell and his countess, Lady Jane Gordon, was procured with indecent haste, and it was suspected that the recent restoration of his consistorial rights to the Archbishop of St. Andrew's, had been made with this object. The process was hurried through the Court of that Prelate, and the Commissariat or reformed court, in two days.¹ After a brief residence at Dunbar, under the roof of the man accused of the murder of her husband, and the forcible seizure of her person, the queen and Bothwell rode to the capital.² As she entered the town, his followers cast away their spears, to save themselves, as was conjectured, from any charge of treason, and their master, with apparent courtesy, dismounting, took the queen's bridle, and led her into the castle under a salvo of artillery.³ It was a sight which her friends beheld with the deepest sorrow, and her enemies with triumph and derision.

A few days after this, Sir Robert Melvil, who had joined the coalition for the revenge of the king's murder and the delivery of the queen, wrote secretly to Cecil. His object was to warn the English minister that France was ready to join the lords against Bothwell, and to excuse, as far as he plausibly could, the unaccountable

¹ Keith, p. 384. Also Orig. St. P. Off. B.C. Drury to Cecil, 2nd May, 1567.

² On the 3rd of May.

³ Anderson, vol. ii., p. 276.

conduct of his mistress. They were resolved, he said, never to consider their sovereign at liberty so long as she remained in the company of that traitor, who had committed so detestable a murder, whatever he might persuade or compel her to say to the contrary. "I understand," said he, "that the nobility are of mind to sute assistance of the queen your mistress, in consideration that the king, who is with God, as well as the queen our sovereign, and the prince her son, are so near of blood to her highness. I believe easy help shall obtain the queen's liberty, and in like manner have the murderers of the king punished. Thus far I will make your honour privy of, that France has offered to enter in band with the nobility of the realm, and to enlist the company of men at arms, and to give divers pensions to noblemen and gentlemen of their realm, which some did like well, but the honest sort has concluded, and brought the rest to the same effect, that they will do nothing which may offend your sovereign, without the fault be in her Majesty, and it appears both Papist and Protestant join together with an earnest affection for the weal of their country."** He then added, that Bothwell, as all thought, would soon end the marriage, and pass to Stirling to seize the prince. He intreated Cecil to consider the queen his sovereign's conduct as rather the effect of the evil counsel of those about her, than proceeding from herself, and lastly begged him to destroy his letter.¹

¹ MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Melvil to Cecil, 7th May, 1567. Dated Kerny in Fife.

Next day Grange wrote on the same subject to Bedford, and in still more striking terms:—
“All such things,” said he, “as were done before the Parliament, I did write unto your lordship at large.** At that time the most part of the nobility, for fear of their lives, did grant to sundry things both against their honours and consciences—who since have convened themselves at Stirling, where they have made a ‘band’ to defend [each] other in all things that shall concern the glory of God and commonweal of their country. The heads that presently they agreed upon is, first, to seek the liberty of the queen, who is ravished and detained by the Earl of Bothwell, who was the ravisher, and hath the strengths, munitions, and men of war at his commandment. The next head is the preservation and keeping of the prince. The third is to pursue them that murdered the king. For the pursuit of these three heads, they have promised to bestow their lives, lands, and goods. And to that effect their lordships have desired me to write unto your lordship, to the end they might have your sovereign’s aid and support for suppressing of the cruel murderer Bothwell, who, at the queen’s last being in Stirling, suborned certain to have poisoned the prince, for that barbarous tyrant is not contented to have murdered the father, but he would also cut off the son, for fear that he hath to be punished hereafter. The names of the lords that convened in Stirling was the Earls of Argile, Morton, Athol, and Mar. Those forenamed, as said is, have desired me to write unto your lordship

to the end that I might know by you, if your sovereign would give them support concerning these three heads above written.*** Wherefore I beseech your lordship, who I am assured loveth the quietness of these two realms, to let me have a direct answer, and that with haste, for presently the foresaid lords are suited unto by Monsieur de Croc, who offereth unto them in his master the King of France's name, if they will follow his advice and counsel, that they shall have aid and support to suppress the Earl Bothwell and his faction.*** Also he hath admonished her [Mary] to desist from the Earl Bothwell, and not to marry him, for if she do he hath assured her, that she shall neither have friendship nor favour out of France, if she shall have to do¹—but his saying is, she will give no ear.***

“ There is to be joined with the four forenamed lords, the Earls of Glencairn, Cassillis, Eglinton, Montrose, Caithness; the Lords Boyd, Ochiltree, Ruthven, Drummond, Gray, Glammis, Innermeith, Lindsay, Hume, and Herries, with all the whole West Merse and Tiviotdale, the most part of Fife, Angus, and Merns. And for this effect the Earl of Argyle is ridden in the west, the Earl of Athol to the north, and the Earl of Morton to Fife, Angus, and Montrose. The Earl of Mar remaineth still about the prince, and if the queen will pursue him, the whole lords have promised, upon their faiths and honour, to relieve him.***

¹ If she shall have to resist her enemies,

“In this meantime the queen is come to the Castle of Edinburgh, conveyed by the Earl Bothwell, where she intendeth to remain until she have levied some forces of footmen and horsemen, that is, she minds to levy 500 footmen and 200 horsemen. The money that she hath presently to do this, which is five thousand crowns, came from the font your lordship brought unto the baptism, the rest is to be reft and borrowed of Edinburgh, or the men of Lothian. ***

“It will please your lordship also to haste these other letters to my Lord of Murray, and write unto him to come back again into Normandy, that he may be in readiness against my lords write unto him.”¹

These important letters of Melvil and Kirkaldy, hitherto quite unknown, establish some new facts in this portion of our history. We see clearly from them that the formidable coalition against the queen, which our historians describe as arising after the marriage with Bothwell, was fully formed nearly a month before that event, that its ramifications were extensive and deep, that Sir Robert Melvil, in whom the Scottish queen reposed implicit confidence, had joined the confederacy, in the hope of rescuing his royal mistress from what he represents as an unwilling servitude; that the plot was well known to Monsieur de Croc, the French ambassador, who after having in vain remonstrated

¹ Copy of the time, St. P. Off. 8th May, 1567, Grange to Bedford. Also MS. Letter, St. P. Off. B.C. Bedford to Cecil, 11th May 1567.

with Mary against her predilection for Bothwell, gave it his cordial support, and lastly, that it had been communicated to Elizabeth, whose assistance was earnestly solicited.

But the English princess cherished high and peculiar ideas of prerogative, and while she ~~blamed in~~ severe terms the conduct of the Scottish queen, she was ~~incensed~~ at the bold and scurrilous tone in which Grange had dared to arraign the proceedings of his sovereign. Upon this point, a remarkable conversation took place between her and Randolph in the palace garden, of which, fortunately, this minister on the same day that it occurred, wrote an account to Leicester. His expressions are forcible. "These news," said he (meaning Mary's intended marriage), "it pleased her majesty to tell me this day (May 10th) walking in her garden, with great misliking of that queen's doing, which now she doth so much detest, that she is ashamed of her. Notwithstanding her majesty doth not like, that her subjects should by any force withstand that which they do see her bent unto, and yet doth she greatly fear, lest that Bothwell having the upper hand, he will rein again with the French, and either make away with the prince, or send him into France, which deliberation her majesty would gladly have stayed, but is very uncertain how it may be brought to pass.

"Her majesty also told me that she had seen a writing sent from Grange to my Lord of Bedford, despitefully written against that queen, in such vile

terms as she could not abide the hearing of it, wherein he made her worse than any common woman. She would not that any subject, what cause soever there be proceeding from the prince, or whatsoever her life and behaviour is, should discover that unto the world, and thereof so utterly misliketh of Grange's manner of writing and doing, that she condemns him for one of the worst in that realm, seeming somewhat to warn me of my familiarity with him, and willing that I should admonish him of her misliking. In this manner of talk, it pleased her majesty to retain me almost an hour."¹

It is now time that we return to the extraordinary course of events in Scotland, which fulfilled the predictions of Melvil and Grange. The church was ordered to proclaim the banns of the queen's marriage. This they peremptorily refused. Craig, one of the ministers, Knox being now absent, alleged as his excuse, that Mary had sent no written command, and stated the common report that she had been ravished, and was kept captive by Bothwell. Upon this, the Justice Clerk brought him a letter signed by the queen herself, asserting the falsehood of such a story, and requiring his obedience. He still resisted, demanded to be confronted

¹ This Letter has never before been published, but is printed in the Appendix to the anonymous privately printed work already mentioned, entitled "Maitland's Narrative. The Appendix consists of letters and other papers relating to the History of Mary Queen of Scotland."

with the parties, and in presence of the privy council, where Bothwell sat, this undaunted minister laid to his charge the dreadful crimes of which he was suspected, rape, adultery, and murder. To the accusation no satisfactory answer was returned, but Craig, having exonerated his conscience, did not deem himself entitled to disobey the express command of his sovereign. He therefore proclaimed the banns in the High Church, but from the pulpit, and in presence of the congregation, added these appalling words: "I take heaven and earth to witness, that I abhor and detest this marriage, as odious and slanderous to the world, and I would exhort the faithful to pray earnestly that a union against all reason and good conscience, may yet be overruled by God, to the comfort of this unhappy realm."¹

This solemn warning, with the deep and general detestation of Bothwell, appeared to produce so little effect upon the queen, that the people considered the whole events as strange and supernatural; the report revived of this abandoned man having employed witchcraft, no uncommon resource in that age, and it was currently asserted, that the marriage day had been fixed by sorcerers.²

On the 12th of May, Mary came in person into

¹ Anderson, vol. iv., p. 280. MS. Letter, St. P. Off. B. C. Drury to Cecil, May 14, 1567. Also Orig. St. P. Off. May 12, 1567, B. C. Drury to Cecil.

² MS. Letter, St. P. Off. B. C. Drury to Cecil, 12th or 13th May, 1567. See also, MS. Letter, St. P. Off. B. C. Same to same, May 20th.

the high court at Edinburgh, and addressed the chancellor, the judges, and the nobility whom she had summoned for the occasion. Having understood, she said, that some doubts had been entertained by the lords, whether they ought to sit for the administration of the laws, their sovereign being detained in captivity at Dunbar by Lord Bothwell, she informed them that they might now dismiss their scruples, for although at first incensed at the conduct of that nobleman in the seizure of her person, she had forgiven him his offence in consequence of his subsequent good conduct, and meant to promote him to still higher honour.¹ On the same day, accordingly, he was created Duke of Orkney and Shetland, the queen with her own hands placing the coronet on his head,² and on the 15th of May, the marriage took place at four in the morning in the presence chamber at Holyrood. It was remarked that Mary was married in her mourning weeds. The ceremony was performed after the rite of the Protestant church by the Bishop of Orkney; Craig, the minister of Edinburgh, being also present. In the sermon which he preached on the occasion, the bishop professed Bothwell's penitence for his former evil life, and his resolution to amend and conform himself to the church.³ Few of the leading

¹ Anderson, vol. i. p. 87.

² MS. Letter, St. P. Off. B. C. Drury to Cecil, 14, May, 1567. Berwick, with its enclosure.

³ MS. Letter, St. P. Off. B. C. Drury to Cecil, May 16, 1567. Also B. C. Same to the same. Berwick, 20th May, 1567.

nobility were present, the event was unattended with the usual pageants and rejoicings, the people looked on in stern and gloomy silence, and next morning a paper with this ominous verse was fixed to the palace gates.

*Mense malus Maio nubere vulgus ait.*¹

¹ The line is from Ovid. *Fastorum*, Lib. V. l. 490.

CHAP. II.

1567 - 1569.

From Mary's Marriage with Bothwell, to the Election of the Regent Murray.

CONTEMPORARY PRINCES.

<i>England.</i>	<i>France.</i>	<i>Germany.</i>	<i>Spain.</i>	<i>Portugal.</i>	<i>Pope.</i>
Elizabeth.	Charles IX.	Maximilian II.	Philip II.	Sebastian.	Pius V.

It was not to be expected that the late appalling events would be regarded with indifference by the people, the reformed clergy, or the more honest part of the nobility. Bothwell was universally reputed the principal murderer of the king ; he was now the husband of their sovereign, and it was commonly reported that he had already laid his schemes to get possession of the young prince, who was kept at Stirling Castle, under the governance of the Earl of Mar. Nor are we to wonder if men even looked with suspicion to the future conduct of the queen herself. She had apparently surrendered her mind to the dominion of a passion which rendered her deaf to every suggestion of delicacy and prudence, almost of virtue. She had refused to listen to the entreaties and arguments of her

best friends, to Lord Herries, who, on his knees implored her not to marry the duke; to de Croc, the French ambassador, who urged the same request; to Beaton, her own ambassador; to Sir James Melvil, whose remonstrances against Bothwell nearly cost him his life.¹ In the face of all this she had precipitated her marriage with this daring and wicked man; and public rumour still accused her of being a party to the murder. Of this last atrocious imputation, indeed, no direct proof was yet brought or offered; but even if we dismiss it as absolutely false, was any mother who acted such a part worthy to be entrusted with the keeping and education of the heir to the throne?

So deeply felt were these considerations, that, as we have seen, a coalition for the destruction of Bothwell, and the preservation of the prince, was now widely organised in Scotland. Of this confederacy Lethington was secretly a member, although he still remained at Dunbar with the queen. Becoming suspected by Bothwell, however, this baron and his associate Huntly had resolved on his death, when Mary threw herself between them, and declared that if a hair of his head perished, it should be at the peril of their life and lands. Thus preserved, he continued his intrigues, and only waited a favourable opportunity to make his escape and join his friends.² The plans

¹ Melvil's *Memoirs*, pp. 176, 177.

² MS. Letter, St. P. Off. B. C. Drury to Cecil, 6 May, 1567. Melvil's *Memoirs*, p. 178.

of the associated lords had been communicated to Murray, then in France; they were sure to meet with the sanction of the Reformed Church, and the sympathy of the people. France encouraged them; and Robert Melvil and Grange, two leading men in the confederacy, had informed Cecil and Elizabeth of their intentions. Her answer was now anxiously expected.

But this princess, at all times jealous of the royal prerogative, was startled when she understood that the combined lords had not only resolved to prosecute Bothwell for the murder, and to rescue the queen from his thralldom but to crown the prince.¹ In reply to the picture they drew of the violent restraint put upon their sovereign, she informed them, that if Mary's own letters to herself were to be trusted, she was in no thralldom, but had consented to all that had happened; she observed that "to crown her son during his mother's life was a matter for example's sake not to be digested by her or any other monarch;" but she added, that if they would deliver the young prince into her hands to be kept in England, she felt inclined to support them. In the mean time the Earl of Bedford was ordered to hasten northward, that he might have an eye on their² movements and afford them some encouragement, whilst Cecil her indefatigable minister had so craftily laid his spies about the court that he received in-

¹ MS. Letter, St. P. Off. B. C. Drury to Cecil, 6 May, 1567.

² MS. Letter, St. P. Off. B. C. Bedford to Cecil, 11th May, 1567, and Copy, Elizabeth to Bedford, 17 May, 1567.

stant information of the minutest movements of Mary and Bothwell, of the French intrigues carried on by de Croc, and of every step taken by the lords of the secret council. For a brief season after their marriage, the queen and the duke appeared to forget that they had an enemy; and when Mary was informed of the private meetings of her opponents, she treated them with contempt; "Athol," said she, "is but feeble, for Argile, I know well how to stop his mouth; as for Morton, his boots are but new pulled off, (alluding to his recent return from banishment) and still soiled, he shall be sent back to his old quarters."¹

In the mean time pageants and tourneys were got up to amuse the people; who observed that their queen, casting off her "mourning weed," assumed a gay dress, and frequently rode abroad with the duke, making a show of great contentment. Bothwell too was studious to treat her with respect, refusing to be covered in her presence, which she sometimes playfully resented, snatching his bonnet and putting it on his head;² but there were times when his passionate and brutal temper broke through all restraint; and to those old friends who were still at court and saw her in private, it was evident, that though she still seemed to love him, she was a changed and miserable woman. On one occasion, which is recorded by Sir James Melvil and de Croc, who were

¹ MS. Letter, St. P. Off. B. C. Drury to Cecil, 20 May, 1567.

² MS. Letter, St. Paper Off. B. C. Drury to Cecil. Berwick, 25 May, 1567. Id. Ibid, B. C. Drury to Cecil, 20th May, and 27th May, 1567.

present, his language was so bitter and disdainful, that in a paroxysm of despair she called for a knife to stab herself.¹

About a fortnight after the marriage she dispatched the Bishop of Dunblane to France and Rome ; his instructions, which have been preserved, were drawn up with much skill, and contained a laboured but unsatisfactory apology for her late conduct.² It was necessary that an envoy should be sent on the same errand to Elizabeth, and here the choice of the queen was unfortunate, for she selected Robert Melvil,³ the secret but determined enemy of Bothwell, and one of the principal associates in the confederacy against him and herself. It is possible that this gentleman, who bore an honourable character in these times, may have considered, that in accepting this commission he should be able to serve his royal mistress ; and whilst he appeared the active agent of her enemies, might secretly check the violence of their designs and labour for her preservation. But whatever may have been his motives, it is certain that he availed himself of the confidence with which he was treated, to reveal her purposes to his confederates, and in the execution of his mission acted for both parties. He received letters from Mary and Bothwell to Elizabeth and Cecil ; he was instructed, as he has himself

¹ Melvil's Memoirs, Bann. Edition, p. 180.

² Keith, p. 388. Also MS. Letter, St. P. Off. B. C. 27 May, 1567, Drury to Cecil. Also Same to same, 20 May, 1567.

³ Declaration of Robert Melvil. Hopetoun, MSS.

informed us, to excuse his mistress's recent marriage, and to persuade Elizabeth not to expose her to shame or declare herself an enemy;¹ and at the same moment he carried letters to the English queen, from the lords of the coalition, who accused her of the murder of her husband, and now meditated her dethronement. So completely was he judged to be in their interest, that Morton, the leader of the enterprise, described him to Elizabeth as their trusty friend, whom they had commissioned to declare their latent enterprise to her majesty.²

Bothwell's letter, which he sent by this envoy to Elizabeth is worthy of notice. It is expressed in a bold, almost a kingly tone; he was aware, he said, of the queen's ill opinion of him, but he protested that it was undeserved, declared his resolution to preserve the amity between the two kingdoms, and professed his readiness to do her majesty all honour and service. Men of greater birth, so he concluded, might have been preferred to the high station he now occupied; none, he boldly affirmed, could have been chosen more zealous for the preservation of her majesty's friendship, of which she should have experience at any time it might be her pleasure to employ him. The style was different from the servility which so commonly ran through the addresses to this haughty queen,

¹ MS. Declaration of Robert Melvil. Hopetoun, MSS.

² MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Maitland to Cecil, 21st and 28th June, 1567. MS. Letter St. P. Off. B.C. Morton and the lords to Elizabeth, Edinburgh, 26 June, 1567.

and marked the proud character of mind which, as much as his crimes, distinguished this daring man.¹

Melvil now left Scotland (June 5) on his mission to the English court; and during his absence, the combined lords rapidly arranged their mode of attack and concentrated their forces. It was judged time to declare themselves, and the contrast between their former and their present conduct was abundantly striking. They who had combined with Bothwell in the conspiracy for the king's murder, and had signed the bond recommending him as a suitable husband for their queen, were now the loudest in their execration of the deed, and their denunciations of the marriage. It was necessary for them, however, from this very circumstance, to act with that caution which accomplices in guilt must adopt when they attempt to expose and punish a companion. If Morton, Argyle, Huntly, Lethington and Balfour, possessed evidence to convict Bothwell and his servants of the murder of the king, it was not to be forgotten that Bothwell could recriminate, and prove, by the production of the bond, that they had consented to the same crime. We know, too, that he had shown this bond to some of the actual murderers, and unless they were slain in hot blood, or made away with before

¹ MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Bothwell to Elizabeth, 5 June, 1567. Bothwell at the same time wrote to Cecil and Sir N. Throckmorton, by Robert Melvil. His letter to Cecil is in the St. P. Off. dated June 5, that to Throckmorton in the possession of Mr. Rodd, bookseller, Great Newport Street,

they had an opportunity of speaking out, the whole dark story might be revealed. These apprehensions which seem to me not to have been sufficiently kept in mind, account for the extraordinary circumstances which soon after occurred.

Mary had summoned her nobles to attend her with their feudal forces on an expedition to Liddesdale, but most of them had already left court, and neglected the order. Huntly, who had been much in her confidence, corresponded with her enemies.¹ Lethington, the secretary, whom we have seen carried prisoner to Dunbar, pretended still to be devoted to her service, but betrayed all her purposes to the confederate lords, and at length finding a good opportunity, suddenly left the court. Murray it was said, had come to England, and taken a decided part against her, and Hume, one of the most warlike and powerful border lords, was active in his opposition.² No army therefore could be assembled; so detested indeed was Bothwell, that even the soldiers whom he had in pay, incurred his suspicion, and it was reported he only trusted one company, commanded by Captain Cullen, a man suspected to be deeply implicated in the king's murder.³

¹ MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Drury to Cecil. B.C. 20th May. 1567.

² MS. Letter, St. P. Off. 7 June, 1567. B.C. Drury to Cecil. Also MS. Letter, St. P. Off. 17th May, 1567. B.C. Drury to Cecil. Also MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Drury to Cecil. B.C. 25 May. 1567.

³ MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Drury to Cecil. B.C. 31st May, 1567, with an undated Letter, probably an enclosure.

Under these circumstances of discouragement, the queen and the duke had retired to Borthwick Castle, a seat of the laird of Crookston's, about ten miles from Edinburgh, when the confederates, led by Hume and the other border chiefs, made a rapid night march, and suddenly surrounded the place. They were nearly a thousand strong, and along with him were Morton, Mar, Lindsay, Grange, and their followers, who deemed themselves sure of their prize, but Bothwell escaped through a postern in the back wall, to Haddington; Here he remained a day in concealment, and then reached Dunbar, where he was next day joined by the queen, who fled in man's apparel, booted and spurred from Borthwick, and thus eluded notice.¹ Disappointed in their first attempt, the confederates marched to the capital, which they reached at four in the morning, broke open the gates, took possession of the city, and published a proclamation, declaring that they had risen in arms to revenge the death of the king, and the forcible abduction of their sovereign.² Here they were soon after joined by the Earl of Athol and the noted Lethington, a man who had belonged to all parties,

¹ Sloane MSS. Ayscough, 3199. Brit. Museum. Copy. John Beaton to his Brother. 11th to 17th June. Printed by Laing, vol. ii. p. 106. MS. Letter, St. P. Off. B. C. Drury to Cecil, Berwick, 12 June, 1567.

² Anderson, vol. i. p. 131. MS. Letter, St. P. Off. B. C. 12 June, 1567. B.C. Drury to Cecil. B. C. MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Same to same. B. C. 14 June, 1567.

and had deserted all, yet whose vigour of mind, and great capacity for state affairs made him still welcome, wherever he turned himself. High wages were now offered to any volunteers who would come forward, and to give greater publicity to the cause for which they fought, a banner was displayed, on which was painted the body of the murdered king, lying under a tree as he had been first found, with the young prince, kneeling beside it and underneath the motto "*Judge and avenge my cause, Oh Lord.*" The sight of this, and the tenor of their proclamation, produced a strong effect, and the confederates had the satisfaction to find, not only that the common people and the magistrates warmly espoused their cause, but that Sir James Balfour, who enjoyed the highest confidence with Bothwell, and commanded the castle, was ready to join them. This infamous man had, as we have seen, been deeply implicated in the murder, and was reported to have some secret papers regarding it in his keeping. His anticipated defection, therefore, gave new spirit to the party.¹

Whilst such was the state of things in the city, Mary and Bothwell had assembled their followers at Dunbar, and such was the effect of the royal name, that many of the border barons and gentry deserted Hume, and joined the queen's camp. Along with them came the lords Seaton, Yester,

¹ Beaton to his Brother; from Sloane MSS. 3199. Laing. Append. vol. ii. p. 106. Also MS. Letter, S. P. Off. Scrope to Cecil. B.C. Carlisle, June 16th, 1567.

and Borthwick, so that within a short time her force amounted to about 2,000 men. With these Mary and the duke instantly marched against the enemy, leaving Dunbar on the 14th June, and advancing that night to Seaton. Next morning she caused a proclamation to be read to the army, in which her opponents were arraigned as traitors, who for their private ends had determined to overturn the government. They pretended, she said, to prosecute the duke her husband, for the king's murder, after he had been already fully acquitted of the crime; they declared their resolution to rescue herself from captivity, but she was no captive as they who had themselves recommended her marriage with the duke well knew; they had taken arms as they affirmed to defend the prince her son—but he was in their own hands, and how then could they think him in danger? in short all was a mere cover for their treason, and this she trusted soon to prove by the aid of her faithful subjects on the persons of these unnatural rebels.¹ Her next step was to entrench herself on Carberry-hill, within the old works which had been thrown up by the English army previous to the battle of Pinky.

Mary here awaited her opponents, who shewed no less alacrity to engage, marching from Edinburgh on the morning of Sunday, the 15th, and taking the route to Musselburgh, which soon

¹ Spottiswood, p. 206. Beaton to his Brother. Laing. vol. ii. p. 106, 110. MS. Letter, St. P. Off, Drury to Cecil. B. C. 14th, June, 1567.

brought them in sight of their adversaries. Monsieur de Croc, the French ambassador, was then with the queen. He had disapproved of her marriage, and we have seen that he had even encouraged the confederates with a view of having the prince sent to France,¹ but he now made an attempt at mediation, and carried a message to Morton and Glencairn, assuring them of their sovereign's disposition to pardon the past, on condition that they returned to their duty. "We have not come here," said Glencairn, when he heard this proposal, "to solicit pardon for ourselves, but rather to give it to those who have offended." "We are in arms," added Morton, "not against our queen, but the duke of Orkney, the murderer of her husband. Let him be delivered up, or let her majesty remove him from her company, and we shall yield her obedience."²

It was evident from this reply that there was little hope of peace, and the confederate lords were the more determined, as an indisposition to fight was beginning to be apparent in the royal troops, some men at that moment stealing over to the enemy. Observing this, Bothwell, who was never deficient in personal courage, rode forward, and by a herald,

¹ MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Drury to Cecil. B. C. 9 June, 1567. Also Same to same. MS. Letter, St. P. Off. 31st May, 1567. Also 15 June, 1567. Bedford to Leicester. MS. Letter, St. P. Off. B. C.

² Keith, p. 401. MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Scrope to Cecil. Carlisle, 17 June, 1567. B. C. Also MS. Letter, St. P. Off. B. C. Drury to Cecil, Berwick, 18th and 19th June 1567.

sent his defiance to any one that dared arraign him of the king's murder. His gage was accepted by James Murray of Tullibardin, the same baron who had, it was said, affixed the challenge to the Tolbooth gate, but Bothwell refused to enter the lists with one who was not his peer, and singled out Morton, who readily answered, that he would fight him instantly on foot and with two-handed swords. Upon this, Lord Lindsay, of the Byres, interfered. The combat, he contended, belonged of right to him, as the relative of the murdered king, and he implored the associate lords by the services he had done, and still hoped to do, that they would grant him the courtesy to meet the duke in this quarrel. It was deemed proper to humour Lindsay, and Morton presented him with his own sword, a weapon well known and highly valued, as having been once wielded by his renowned ancestor, Archibald Bell the Cat. Lindsay then proceeded to arm himself, and kneeling down before the ranks, audibly implored God to strengthen his arm to punish the guilty, and protect the innocent. Bothwell too seemed eager to fight, but at this critical juncture, Mary interfered, and resolutely forbad the encounter.¹

By this time it was evident that desertion was spreading rapidly in her army, nor had her remonstrances the least effect: she implored them to ad-

¹ Copy of the time. St. P. Off. — to Cecil, June 16th, 1567. Also MS. Letter, St. P. Off. B. C. Drury to Cecil, June 19th, 1567, with enclosure. Calderwood MS. Hist. Ayscough, 4735, p. 668. Also Spottiswood, p. 207.

vance, assured them of victory, taunted them with cowardice, but all to so little purpose, that when Grange at the head of his troops, began to wheel round the hill so as to turn their flank, the panic became general, and the queen and Bothwell were left with only sixty gentlemen, and the band of hackbutter.¹ It was his design to throw himself between Dunbar and this little force, thus cutting off Bothwell's escape, but Mary perceived it, and sent the laird of Ormiston to demand a parley. This was immediately granted, and when Grange rode forward, he assured his sovereign of their readiness to obey her, if that man who now stood beside her, and was guilty of the king's murder, were dismissed. To this she replied, that if the lords promised to return to their allegiance, she would leave the duke and put herself in their hands. He carried this message to his brethren, and came back with a solemn assurance that on such conditions they were ready to receive and obey her as their sovereign. Hearing this, the queen, ever too credulous and apt to act on the impulse of the moment, held a moment's conversation aside with Bothwell. What passed can only be conjectured; he appeared to waver, and remonstrate, but when she gave him her hand, he took farewell, turned his horse's head and rode off the field, none of the confederates offering the least impediment.² It was the last time they ever met.

¹ MS. Letter, St. P. Off. B. C. Scrope to Cecil, June 17, 1567.

² Raumer quoting de Croc's despatches, p. 100, 101. De Croc says in his letter to Catherine de Medici, "Bothwell became

Mary now waited for some time till he was out of danger, and then coming forward exclaimed. "Laird of Grange, I surrender to you on the conditions you have specified in the name of the lords." That baron then took her hand, which he kissed, and holding her horse's bridle, conducted her down the hill to the confederates. On reaching the lines, she was met by the nobles who received her on their knees. Here madam, said Morton, is the true place where your grace should be, and here we are ready to defend and obey you as loyally as ever nobility of this realm did your progenitors." So fully felt was this sentiment, that when some of the common soldiers began to utter opprobrious language, Grange drew his sword and compelled them into silence.

Such was the extraordinary scene which led to the escape of Bothwell, and it demands a moment's reflection. The confederate nobles had declared that their object in taking arms was, to bring this infamous man to justice, as the murderer of the king, yet at the moment when they had him in their power, he was permitted to escape. Nothing could appear more inconsistent, and yet perhaps looking to the motives which have been already pointed out, it will not be greatly alarmed, and at last asked the queen whether she would keep the promise of fidelity which she had made to him. She answered yes, and gave him her hand upon it. He then mounted his horse, and fled with a few attendants."—All this, however, must, as I have said, be conjecture.—De Croc was not present—after his unsuccessful attempt at mediation, he had retired to Edinburgh. Spottiswood, p. 207.

found unnatural. He, indeed, was the principal murderer, but Morton, Huntly, Lethington, and Argyle, were aware, that if driven to his defence, he could bring them in as accomplices. They allowed him to escape, because he was infinitely more easily dealt with as a fugitive than as a prisoner.

But to return to Mary. Encouraged by the first appearances of courtesy, she declared her wish to communicate with the Hamiltons, who, the night before, had advanced in considerable strength to Linlithgow. This was peremptorily refused, upon which she broke into reproaches, appealed to their promise, and demanded how they dared to treat her as a prisoner? Her questions and her arguments were unheeded, and she now bitterly repented her precipitation. Her spirit, however, instead of being subdued, was rather roused by their baseness. She called for Lindsay, one of the fiercest of the confederate barons, and bad him give her his hand. He obeyed. "By the hand," said she, "which is now in yours, I'll have your head for this."¹ Unfortunate princess! When she spoke thus, little did she know how soon that unrelenting hand, which had been already stained with Riccio's blood, would fall still heavier yet upon herself.

It was now evening, and the queen riding between Morton and Athol, was conducted to the capital,

¹ MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Drury to Cecil. B.C. June 18, 1567. Also Copy St. P. Off. June 16, 1567, Anonymous—to Cecil.

where she awoke to all the horrors of her situation.¹ She was a captive in the hands of her worst enemies. The populace, as she rode through the streets, received her with yells and execrations, the women pressing round, accused her in coarse terms as an adulteress stained with her husband's blood; and the soldiers, unrestrained by their officers, kept constantly waving before her eyes the banner on which was painted the murdered king, and the prince crying for vengeance. At first they shut her up in the provost's house, where she was strictly guarded. It was in vain she remonstrated against this breach of faith; in vain she implored them to remember that she was their sovereign: they were deaf to her entreaties, and she was compelled to pass the night, secluded even from her women, in solitude and tears. But the morning only brought new horrors. The first object which met her eyes was the same dreadful banner, which, with a refinement in cruelty, the populace had hung up directly opposite her windows. The sight brought on an agony of despair and delirium, in the midst of which she tore the dress from her person, and, forgetting that she was almost naked, attempted in her phrenzy to address the people.² This piteous spectacle could not be seen without producing an impression in her favour,

¹ Letter of John Beaton to his Brother, Sloane MSS. Aycough, 3199, printed by Laing, vol. ii. p. 106.

² John Beaton to his Brother, 17 June, 1567. Laing, vol. ii., App. p. 106.

and the citizens were taking measures for her rescue when she was suddenly removed to Holyrood. Here a hurried consultation was held, and in the evening she was sent a prisoner to Lochleven, a castle situated in the midst of a lake, belonging to Douglas, one of the confederates, and from which escape was deemed impossible. In her journey thither, she was treated with studied indignity, exposed to the gaze of the mob, miserably clad, mounted on a sorry hackney, and placed under the charge of Lindsay and Ruthven, men of savage manners, even in this age, and who were esteemed peculiarly fitted for the task.¹ Against this base conduct, it is said, that Grange loudly remonstrated, and that, to silence his reproaches, the lords produced an intercepted letter, written by the queen from her prison in Edinburgh to Bothwell, in which she assured him that she would never desert him. The story is told by Melvil, but I have found no trace of it, and Grange had already manifested such bitter hostility to his sovereign, that his sincerity may be questioned, especially as he continued to act with his former associates.²

Thus far the measures of the confederates were crowned with success. The queen was a prisoner in their hands ; they were possessed of the person of the heir apparent, who had been committed to the governance of Mar, one of their principal leaders ;

¹ Id. Ibid. Also MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Drury to Cecil, B. C. June 18, 1567.

² Melvil's *Memoirs*, Bannat. edition, p. 185.

Bothwell was a fugitive, and they were sustained in every thing they had done by the support of the ministers of the Reformed Church, and by the general voice of the people. For the present, therefore, all was deemed secure, and on considering their future policy, they determined to pause till it was seen with what feelings the late events were regarded by England and France. With this view they lost no time in despatching letters, first to Elizabeth, and after a little interval to the King of France. To the English queen they declared that their only motive in taking up arms had been the punishment of the king's murder; they assured her, that so soon as this was accomplished, their sovereign should be restored to freedom, and as for the coronation of the young prince, that such an idea had never been contemplated. In conclusion, they expressed a hope that she would consider their want of money, and send them the sum of three or four thousand crowns to hire soldiers, in return for which they were ready to refuse the offers of France, and submit to be wholly guided by England.¹

To France their letters were full of amity, but more general and guarded. De Croc, the ambassador, had at once perceived the advantage of securing the friendship of the successful party.

¹ MS. Letter, St. P. Off. B. C. Sir John Forster to Cecil, June 20, 1567. The messenger's name was John Rede, with Instructions inclosed. Also St. P. Off. Drury to Cecil, June 20, 1567. Also MS. Letter, St. P. Off. B. C. Bedford to Cecil, June 23, 1567.

Although pretending a great zeal for Mary's service, he really favoured the confederates, and had not only proposed that the young prince should be brought up under the care of the king his master, but advised them to keep the queen of Scots securely, now that they had her in their hands.¹ To him the confederates gave fair words, but prudently determined not to commit themselves, till they heard more definitively from England. They at the same time entered into communication with Murray and the Earl of Lennox, whose presence they required in Scotland.²

At this crisis (June 20), according to the evidence of Cecil's journal, which has been, on insufficient grounds, I think, suspected of forgery, the lords of the secret council, through the treachery of a servant of Bothwell's, became possessed of a box or casket, which was said to contain some private letters and sonnets addressed by the queen to the duke. This was that celebrated silver casket, which afterwards made so much noise, and in which, as asserted by the enemies of Mary, were found decided proofs of her guilt. The whole details connected with the story are suspicious, nor is it the least suspicious of these circumstances, that in the confidential letters of Drury to Cecil, written at this period from day to day, and embra-

¹ MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Drury to Cecil, B. C. June 20, 1567.

² MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Drury to Cecil, B. C. July 9, 1567. Also MS. Letter, St. P. Off. B. C. July 12. Same to same, and July 19, Scrope to Cecil.

cing the most minute information of every thing which passed, there is no allusion to such a seizure. It is, however, to be remembered that Morton, Lethington, and Sir James Balfour, the three great leaders of the confederacy, were themselves deeply implicated in the assassination of Darnley, and that they would be exceedingly likely to suppress such a discovery, till the contents of the casket were rigidly examined. They knew that Bothwell was in possession of the bond for the king's murder, and the casket might contain it, or other papers equally conclusive. It is certain, that on the day of this reported discovery (June 20), Morton and his associates despatched George Douglas, one of the most confidential of their number, on a secret mission to the Earl of Bedford, and it is possible his message may have related to it.¹ In this mysterious state we must leave the matter at present.

On hearing of the late extraordinary events in Scotland, Elizabeth's feelings were of a divided kind. Her ideas of the inviolability of the royal prerogative, were offended by the imprisonment of the queen. However great were Mary's faults, or even her guilt, it did not accord with the high creed of the English princess, that any subjects should dare to expose or punish them, and we have seen, that in a former conversation with Randolph, she alluded to Grange's letters to Bedford, in terms of

¹ MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Bedford to Cecil, B. C. June 23, 1567. Also MS. Letter. St. P. Off. Morton and the Lords to Bedford, June 20, 1567.

much bitterness.¹ But notwithstanding this, she was fully alive to the necessity of supporting a Protestant party in Scotland, and she well knew that nothing could so effectually promote her views, as to induce the confederate lords to refuse the offers of France, and deliver to her the young prince to be educated in Protestant principles at the court of England. Nor was she ignorant that the able and crafty men who directed their proceedings, had determined to refuse every petition for the restoration of their sovereign to liberty, an event probably as much deprecated by Elizabeth as by themselves.² It was perfectly safe for the English queen therefore, to give fair promises to Mary, and to remonstrate with the confederates upon this subject. Such being her views, she despatched Robert Melvil, who was then in England, with a letter to his mistress, and ordered Sir Nicholas Throckmorton, one of her ablest diplomatists, to hold himself in readiness to proceed on a mission to Scotland.

Meanwhile the lords of the secret council, who had suffered the principal actor in the king's murder to escape, became active in their search for inferior delinquents. Captain Cullen, a daring follower of Bothwell's, had been seized on their first advance to Edinburgh, and soon after two others, Captain Blacater, and Sebastian de Villours, were apprehended. The foreigner was soon discharged, but

¹ Randolph to Leicester, May 10, 1567. See *supra*, p. 60.

² Gonzalez Apuntamientos, p. 322. *Memorias de la Real Acad. de la Historia*, vol. vii.

Blacater was tried for the murder, convicted, and executed before an immense concourse of spectators, who eagerly surrounded the scaffold. To their disappointment he died solemnly calling God to witness his innocence, and revealed no particulars.¹ Of Cullen, who, it was reported, on his apprehension, had discovered the whole details of the conspiracy, we hear no more. It is possible, he may have been commanded to say nothing, because he might have told too much.

These efforts of the confederates to bring the guilty to justice, did not satisfy the people ; it was suspected that amongst their leaders, were some who dreaded any strict examination, and Morton and Lethington, distrusting the fickle nature of the lower classes, began to dread a re-action in the queen's favour. This was the more alarming, as the rival faction of the Hamiltons had recently mustered in great strength. The head of this party was nominally the Duke of Chastelherault, now in France, but really his brother the Archbishop of St. Andrew's. Failing Mary and her son, the duke was next heir to the throne, and he and his advisers had acuteness enough to penetrate into the views of Morton and his party. They saw clearly that the consequence of the continued captivity of their sovereign, must be the coronation of the young prince, his protection by Elizabeth, and the establishment

¹ MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Drury to Cecil, B. C. June 25, Also B. C. June 27, 1567. Same to same. Also *Historie of James the Sext*, p. 15, Bannat. edition.

of a regency under which Lennox, Morton, or Murray, would engross the whole power of the state. Having been generally opposed to Mary and her marriage, her captivity was not in itself a matter which gave them any very deep concern, but in weighing the two evils, its continuance and a regency, or her restoration and a third marriage, they chose what they thought the least, and determined to make an effort for her restoration.

For this purpose, a convention of the lords of their party was held at Dumbarton (June 29), and proclamation made for all good subjects to be ready on nine hours warning to take arms for the delivery of the queen.¹ They were here joined by Argile and Huntly, who had deserted the confederates, by Herries, a baron of great power, and vigour of character, and by Crawford, with the Lords Seaton and Fleming, whilst the Archbishop of St. Andrew's, and the celebrated Lesly, Bishop of Ross, directed their councils.² Their deliberations were watched and reported to his court by de Croc, the French ambassador, who found them as

¹ MS. Letter, St. P. Off. B. C. Drury to Cecil—He states that “the confederates are very anxious for Lennox's return into Scotland, to beard the Hamiltons.” June 20, 1567.. Also Same to same, June 25, 1567. St. P. Off. B. C. Also Same to same, MS. Letter, St. P. Off. B. C. June 29, and Same to same, July 1, 1567, B. C.

² Bond signed by the Convention at Dumbarton, June 29, 1567. St. P. Off. and printed by Keith, p. 436.

was to be anticipated, more inclined to France than England.¹

It was not to be expected that the lords of the secret council could view such proceedings without anxiety, and they thought it prudent to strengthen themselves by a more intimate union with the party of the Reformed Church. Here, indeed, was their strongest hold ; for the reformed clergy were sternly opposed to the queen, they firmly believed that she was participant in the king's murder, and they possessed the highest influence with the people.

On their taking possession of the capital, immediately after their unsuccessful attempt at Borthwick, Glencairn, one of the fiercest zealots of these times, had signalized his hatred of popery by an attack upon the royal chapel at Holyrood, in which he demolished the altar, and destroyed the shrines and images. This attack, although condemned by some of the party, was not unwelcome to the ministers, and on the 25th of June, an assembly of the church was held at Edinburgh. In this meeting of his friends and brethren, John Knox re-appeared. This great leader of the Reformed Church, had fled, as we have seen,² from the capital, immediately after the assassination of Riccio, and had deemed it unsafe to return, till the queen was imprisoned in Lochleven. Of his history in this interval, we know little ; he probably resided chiefly

¹ MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Drury to Cecil, B. C. June 29, 1567.

² Supra p. 43.

with his relatives in the neighbourhood of Berwick, and he was in England at the time of the king's murder,¹ but about a month after that event, he again entered into communication with Bedford and Cecil,² and now that all fear from the animosity of the queen was at an end, and the chief power in the government once more in the hands of his friends, he again took his part in the discussions which agitated the country.

In his retirement, he appears to have lost nothing of his wonted fire. He was animated by the same stern, uncompromising, and unscrupulous spirit as before, and the crisis appeared to him to be highly favourable for the complete demolition of popery, and the permanent establishment of the Protestant faith. Henceforward we must regard him as the leader of the Reformed Church, and upon certain conditions he declared himself ready to give his cordial assistance to the confederates. He stipulated that they should recognize the parliament held at Edinburgh in 1560, and its acts as laws of the realm. It will be recollected, that this was the famous parliament in which popery had been overthrown, and the reformed religion established, and that notwithstanding all the efforts of Elizabeth and the Protestants, Mary had never given her consent to its decrees. The confederates, who were mostly, if not all, Protestants, of course experienced no such scruples, but em-

¹ Mc Crie's *Life of Knox*, vol. ii., p. 150.

² MS. Letter, St. P. Off. B. C. Bedford to Cecil, March 11, 1566-7.

braced the proposal at once, and entered into the strictest union with Knox and his party. Nor was this all. They agreed to restore the patrimony of the church which had been seized and devoted to civil uses, to entrust the education of youth in all colleges and public seminaries to the reformed clergy, to put down idolatry (so they denominated the Roman Catholic faith) by force of arms, if necessary, to watch over the education of the prince, committing him to some godly and grave governor, and to punish to the uttermost the murderers of the king.¹ In return for this, Knox adopted the cause of the lords of the Secret Council (such was the title by which the confederacy against Mary and Bothwell was now known), with all the energy belonging to his character. From former experience, none knew better than this extraordinary man the strength of popular opinion when once roused, and few understood better how to rouse it by that style of pulpit eloquence which he had adopted:—earnest, sententious, satirical, colloquial, often coarse, but always to the point, and always successful. There can be little doubt, I think, that the great secondary cause of the establishment of the Reformation in Scotland was the force of popular opinion, roused, directed, and kept in continual play, by the sermons and addresses of the clergy. Such an engine was not permitted in

¹ Knox: Hist. p. 449. Spottiswood, p. 210. MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Drury to Cecil, B. C. Berwick, June 25, 1567. Also MS. Letter, B. C. June 27, 1567. Same to the same.

England by Elizabeth and her ministers: Knox regretted it, and repeatedly requested license to preach at Berwick, but he was invariably refused.

An attempt was made at this time to bring over the Hamiltons and their associates to the confederates,¹ and letters were written in the name of the Church to Argyle, Huntly, Herries, and others requesting their presence at Edinburgh, on the 20th July, to which day they had adjourned their assembly. To enforce this, Knox, with three colleagues, Douglas, Row, and Craig, waited upon them, and urged the necessity of their attendance, that they might labour for the re-establishment of the policy and patrimony of the Church. But the Hamiltons suspected the overtures, and the secret council, who dreaded lest delay should give strength to their enemies, determined to compel the queen to abdicate the government in favour of the prince her son.

The known character of Mary, however, rendered this daring resolution a matter of no easy accomplishment. Her confinement in Lochleven had been accompanied with circumstances of great rigour; she was there placed under the charge of Lindsay and Ruthven, men familiar with blood, and of coarse and fierce manners. The lady of the castle, Margaret Erskine, daughter of Lord Erskine, had been mistress to the queen's father, James V., and was mother to the Earl of Mur-

¹ MS. Letter, St. P. Off. B. C. Berwick. Drury to Cecil, June 25, 1567.

ray. She had been afterwards married to Sir Robert Douglas; and their son, William Douglas, who was proprietor of the castle, had early joined the confederacy. She herself is said to have been a woman of a proud and imperious spirit, and was accustomed to boast that she was James's lawful wife, and her son Murray, his legitimate issue, who had been supplanted by the queen.¹

Under such superintendents, Mary could not expect a lenient captivity; but her spirit was unbroken, though Villeroy, a gentleman sent to her by the king of France, was denied all access, and it became impossible for her to receive advices of the proceedings of the Hamiltons, from the strictness with which all communication was cut off.² She had sent, as we have seen, Robert Melvil on a mission to the English queen soon after her marriage. During his stay in England those sad calamities had occurred, with which we are acquainted; and now that she was a prisoner, shut out from all friendly intercourse, and fed only with the deferred hopes that sicken the heart, she looked anxiously for his return.

But this servant had, as we have seen, become the envoy of her enemies. During his stay in England, he had acted as the secret agent of the confederate lords, who had imprisoned her; he solicited money to support them in their enterprise; he received orders from them to supply

¹ Keith, p. 403.

² MS. Letter, St. P. Off. B. C. Drury to Cecil. 27 June, 1567. Also Id: Same to same, June 20, 1567.

himself out of this sum when it was advanced by Elizabeth; he was cautioned against declaring himself too openly, as something had come to the ears of the French ambassador:¹ he proposed to the English queen the project for Mary's "demitting the crown" in favour of her son, with which the lords who had imprisoned her, had made him acquainted; and on his arrival in Edinburgh, his first meeting was neither with his own sovereign nor the friends, who had combined for her delivery, but with the lords of the secret council. He assured them of the support of the English queen, in the "honourable enterprise," in which they had engaged; he informed them that Elizabeth had agreed to Mary's resignation of the crown, provided it came of her own consent; and he then, before visiting his mistress in her prison at Lochleven, addressed a letter to Cecil, from which, as it contains his own account of his negotiation, I think it right to give this extract, "It may please your honour," says he, "to be advertised, I came to this town, (Edinburgh,) upon the 29th of June, and have² imparted the queen's majesty's good disposition in the assisting and partaking with the lords to prosecute the murderers of the king, and to preserve the prince in the custody of the Earl of Mar.

¹ MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Melvil to Cecil, 1st July, 1567; also MS. Letter, Melvil to Cecil, June, 1567; and MS. Letter, in Cipher with the decipher affixed. David Robertson to Melvil, June 26, 1567; also MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Earls of Athol, Morton, and others to Elizabeth, 26 June, 1567.

² In Orig. "has."

Whereof the said lords most humbly thank her highness. The whole particularities that I had your honour's advice in, according to the queen your sovereign's meaning, is not at this present resolved on, by reason the most part of noblemen are gone to their houses, to repose them, and their friends, except the Earls of Morton and Athol, with my Lord Hume, my Lord Ledington, Sir James Balfour, captain of the castle, who is daily in council with them, and Mr. James Makgill and the justice clerk. The cause of their going from this town is by some bragging of the Hamiltons, with the Earl of Huntly, minding to convene their forces and make their colour (pretence) for the delivery of the queen ; albeit, it be credibly reported, that they fear the king's murder to be laid to some of their charges ; I mean the Bishop of St. Andrew's ; wherefore it was thought most convenient that the noblemen and gentlemen should in the meantime have their friends in readiness.

“ Before my coming, the lords did write divers instructions unto me, besides a letter written to the Queen's majesty,¹ subscribed by them. The effect whereof was, that as they did understand by me of the good inclination [of] your mistress and council being addicted to help them in their most need, so for their parts their goodwill to do her majesty service, before all other, with time shall be declared. As for their dealing with France, they have used them so discreetly, as neither France

¹ Elizabeth.

may have any just cause to be offended, and the queen your sovereign be well pleased.

“ The lords presently needs but money, for they have already listed divers men of war, and is taking up more. The Hamiltons is judged to be maintained by the queen's¹ substance, and countenanced by France to have money, seeing France is in doubt to persuade our noblemen. Wherefore, Sir, it is most needful, that with all expedition money may be procured of the queen, your sovereign, and sent thither with Sir Nicholas Fragmarton² or by some of the borders, for that necessity that they will be prest to, will be within eight or ten days, which I thought meet to advertise your honour of; and what order shall be taken for my going to the queen is not agreed upon, by reason the most part of lords are not present; and my Lord Ledington being greatly empesched with affairs, might not have leisure to concur at length, but is glad to understand of the care your honour has, that we should do all things by justice and moderation. And that the queen your sovereign may be content with your conference with me, he does well like of your advice in divers heads; always, there is matter enough probable³ to proceed upon that matter we first agreed upon, and farther is thought expedient.—Ye shall with diligence be advertised; and refers the rest to my Lord of Ledington's letter, who does repose him-

¹ Mary's.

² Sir N. Throkmorton.

³ Probable, here used in the sense of *proveable*.

self upon the care he hopes your honour will continue in for to set forward their honourable enterprise; and the lords for their part will accord with your ambassador to keep the prince: and to her highness desire will put him in the custody of her majesty, if at any time hereafter they shall be minded to suffer him go in any other country. The whole novels¹ here I refer to my Lord of Ledington's letter; and as I learn further your honour shall be advertised. * * * At Edinburgh, the first of July. . R. Melvil."²

This letter sufficiently explains itself, and proves, that Melvil, although nominally the envoy of Mary, was now acting for the confederates. It unveils also the real intentions of Elizabeth. It shows that her object in dispatching her ambassador, Sir Nicholas Throckmorton, was professedly to procure the queen's liberty; but really to encourage the confederates, to attach them to her service, to obtain possession of the prince if possible, to induce the captive queen to resign the crown, and to hold out to Murray, with whom she, Melvil, and the lords of the secret council were now in treaty, the hope of returning to his country and becoming the chief person in the government.³ It appears to me also (but this is conjecture), that the mysterious sen-

¹ Novels—news.

² MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Robert Melvil to Cecil. Edinburgh, 1st July, 1567.

³ MS. Letter, St. P. Off. R. Melvil to Cecil, 8 July, 1567. Kerny in Fife.

tence¹ in which Melvil informs Cecil that Lethington liked his advice, and that at any rate they had proof enough to proceed on the matter first agreed upon, related to the scheme of compelling their sovereign to agree to their wishes by a threat of bringing her to a public trial for the murder of the king.

On the same day on which this letter was written (July 1st) Melvil repaired to Lochleven, and was admitted to an interview with Mary, in which he delivered to her, the letter of the queen of England. At this conference Lindsay, Ruthven, and Douglas insisted on being present, according to the orders which they had received from the lords of the secret council. The queen was thus cut off from all private conference with her servant, and she complained bitterly of such rigour, but could obtain no redress. Eight days afterwards, however, Melvil was again sent by them to Lochleven and permitted to see his royal mistress alone. In this interview he endeavoured (according to his own declaration,)² to persuade Mary to renounce Bothwell, but this she peremptorily refused, and her obduracy upon this point excited the utmost indignation in the lords and the people.

¹ "He (Lethington) does well like of your advice in divers heads, always there is matter enough probable (proveable) to proceed upon that matter we first agreed upon, and farther is thought expedient."

² Robert Melvil's Declaration, Hopetoun, MSS. Also MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Sir James Melvil to Drury. Edinburgh, 8 July, 1567.

Knox, now all powerful with the lower ranks, thundered out, as Throkmorton expressed it to Cecil, *cannon-hot* against her, and so thoroughly convinced were his party and some of the leaders, of her guilt, that it became generally reported, she would be brought to a public trial. So much was this the case, that early in July Lord Herries held a meeting with Lord Scrope, in which when the English warden attempted to detach him from Mary's interests, he declared that if Morton and his faction would set his mistress at liberty, he was ready to assist them in prosecuting the king's murder, but if they intended to bring the queen to her trial by open assize, he would defend her, though forsaken by all the world.¹

In the meantime, Sir Nicholas Throkmorton, Elizabeth's ambassador, left the English court on his mission to Scotland. We have seen that the English queen, in her message to Morton and his confederates, by Robert Melvil, had encouraged them in their enterprise, and promised them her support, but her instructions to Throkmorton, although severely worded, were more favourable to the captive queen. He was directed indeed to express her grief and indignation that decided steps had not been taken for the punishment of the king's murder, to point out the mortal reproach she had incurred by her marriage, and to assure her, that at first she had resolved to give

¹ MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Scrope to Cecil. B. C. Carlisle. 9th July, 1567.

up all farther communication with one who seemed by her acts so reckless of her honour; but he was instructed to add, that the late rebellious conduct of her nobles had softened these feelings. Whatever had been Mary's conduct, it did not (she said) belong to subjects to assume the sword, or to punish the faults of the prince, and so much did she commiserate and resent her imprisonment, that she was prepared to compel her nobles to restore her to liberty. At the same time she was ready to lend her countenance and assistance for the prosecution of the king's murder, and the preservation of the young prince. In conclusion, Throkmorton was enjoined to declare to the Scottish queen, the charges with which she was loaded by her subjects, and to hear her answers and defence.¹

On crossing the border, the ambassador was met by Lethington, the secretary, at Coldinghame, who conducted him to Fascastle, a strong fortalice overhanging the German Ocean.² Here he was received by Hume, the lord of the castle, with Sir James Melvil; and in a conference, held with the Scottish secretary, it was soon apparent that he had to deal with those who were as crafty, cautious, and diplomatic as himself or his mistress. On the sameday he wrote to Cecil, and informed him that the

¹ Brit. Mus. Cotton. MSS. Caligula. C. 1. f. 3. Instructions to Sir N. Throkmorton, 30 June, 1567.

² Robertson's Appendix, No. XXI. Throkmorton to Cecil, 12th July, 1567. Fascastle is described by him as "very little and very strong—a place fitter to lodge prisoners than folks at liberty."

Scottish lords dreaded Elizabeth's caprice. They assured themselves, he said, "that if they ran her fortune, she would leave them in the briars," and desert them after they had committed themselves. Already they complained that she had departed from her first promises to Robert Melvil, and had sent a cold answer to their last letter, and as for her proposal to set their sovereign at liberty, if sincere in this, it was plain (they said) that the queen of England sought their ruin, for were Mary once free, it would be absurd to talk of the prosecution of the murder, or indeed of any other condition.

Touching their intended policy to France, a subject upon which Elizabeth was exceedingly jealous, Throk Morton found them resolved to hold, for the present, the same cautious course which they pursued to England, neither positively refusing nor accepting the overtures of the French king. These, indeed, as Lethington reported them to the English ambassador, were of an extraordinary description, and if Mary owed little gratitude to Elizabeth, she was certainly still less obliged to her royal relatives at that court whose exertions at this moment were strenuously devoted to the setting up a party in Scotland composed of her enemies, the confederate lords. In accomplishing this, they were ready to sacrifice the captive queen. It was suggested that the government and the young prince should be managed by a council of the lords, acting, of course, under French influence, and as for the queen

herself, de Croc, the ambassador proposed to rid them of her altogether, and shut her up in a French convent.¹

It is probable that the Scottish secretary had not exaggerated these intentions of France, for we find, that at this very time the greatest exertions were made by the French king to secure the services of the Earl of Murray then at his court.² These splendid bribes he steadily rejected, but on the other hand, he was so far from embracing the interests of Morton and his associates, that he dispatched one of his servants, Nicholas Elphinston, on a mission to the Scottish queen, assuring her of his devotion to her service.

Elphinston arrived in London a few days after Throk Morton's departure for Scotland. He was there admitted to a secret interview with Elizabeth, which lasted for an hour, and his communication had the effect of rendering her more favourable to Mary, and more hostile to the confederate lords. There is a curious piece of secret history connected with the interview between this envoy of Murray and Elizabeth, which is to be found in

¹ Robertson's Appendix, No. XXI. Throk Morton to Cecil, Fawcastle, 12th July, 1567.

² MS. Letter, St. P. Off. *French Corresp.* Norris to Elizabeth, Poissy, 2 July, 1567. Same to Cecil. MS. Letter, Poissy, 2d July, 1567. Also MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Norris to Cecil, Paris, 16 July, 1567. " * * Great is the travel and pain that hath been here taken to win the Earl of Murray, offering both the Order, and great augmentation of living, which, as he hath sent me word, he hath refused, lest, by taking gifts, he should be bound where he is now free."

a letter of Mr. Heneage, a gentleman of the court, to Cecil. This person was in waiting in the ante-chamber of the palace, when Elizabeth, after dismissing Murray's messenger, called him hastily and sent him to Cecil. He was directed by her to inform the prime minister that Murray had dispatched his servant with letters to the Queen of Scotland, expressive of his attachment, and offering his service; that they were to be delivered to her own hands, and not to be seen by the confederates; and that he had in charge also to remonstrate with them for their audacity in imprisoning their sovereign. But this was not all. The rest of the commission given by the English queen to Heneage, is still more interesting in furnishing us with an admission from her own lips of that insidious dealing which so often marked her policy. Tell Cecil, said she, that he must instantly write a letter, in my name, to my Sister, to which I will set my hand, for I cannot write it myself, as I have not "used her well and faithfully in these broken matters that be past. The purport of it must be to let her know that the Earl of Murray never spoke diffamedly of her for the death of her husband, never plotted for the secret conveying of the prince to England, never confederated with the lords to depose her, on the contrary, now in my Sister's misery let her learn from me the truth, and that is, that she has not a more faithful and honourable servant in Scotland.¹ At this date,

¹ MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Mr. T. Heneage to Cecil, From the Court, 8th July, 1567.

therefore, (July 8th) if we are to believe this evidence, and there seems no good reason to question it, Murray was no party to the schemes of the confederates. On the contrary, he had declared himself against them, and was resolved to support and defend the queen his sovereign.

But to return to Throkmorton. This ambassador proceeded from Fascal castle to the capital, accompanied by Lord Hume, and an escort of four hundred horse. The day after his arrival (July 13) there was a solemn fast held by the Reformed Church, the leaders of which were decided enemies of the Scottish Queen, and his first impressions gave him little hope, either that he would be permitted to visit the royal captive, or be able to do her much good.¹ Nor did the confederate lords seem in any haste to have a conference with him, and when he accidentally met their leader, Morton, he excused himself from entering upon business, as the day was devoted to sacred exercises. Lethington, however, came to him in the evening, and from the tone of his conversation, it was apparent to the ambassador, that they were determined he should not be allowed to see Mary. They had already, he said, refused the French ambassador, and in the present state of things, they did not chuse to irritate France.

As to the probable fate of the unhappy prisoner, Throkmorton found all things looking gloomily. Her

¹ Throkmorton to the Queen. Edinburgh, 14 July, 1567. Robertson, Appendix No. XXI.

chief supporters, the party of the Hamiltons, were divided in their councils, and almost equally treacherous in their intentions with her more open enemies. Being next heirs to the crown, it was generally believed, that they would have been glad to have got rid both of Mary and the prince; and if we may credit Throk Morton, they only “made a shew of the liberty of the queen, that they might induce these lords to destroy her, rather than they should recover her by violence out of their hands.” Argile was tampering with the lords of the secret council. Herries, though more attached to her service, was not to be trusted when his own interests came in the way, the French king and the queen mother were ready to desert her, if they could gain the confederates, and singular as the fact may appear to those who have given credit to the attacks of his opponents, her only true friend, at this moment, was the Earl of Murray. He had despatched Elphinston, as we have seen, to visit Mary and assure her of his services, and this envoy arrived in the capital much about the same time with Throk Morton. But when he requested to have access to the queen, and deliver his letters, he received a peremptory denial.¹ It has been often asserted, and very commonly believed, that from the first rising of the lords against Mary and Bothwell, Murray was one of their party, in active corre-

¹ Throk Morton to Elizabeth, 18th July, 1567. Also Same to same, July 14th, 1567. Both letters in Robertson's Appendix, No. XXI. And Same to same, June 19th, 1567. Caligula, C. i. fol. 18.

spondence with them, yet how are we to reconcile this with his present attachment to Mary's interests, his rejection of the offers of France, and the jealousy with which he was regarded by the confederates. But of all the enemies of the miserable queen, the most bitter were the Presbyterian clergy and the people. In the midst of their austerity and devotional exercises, the ministers expressed themselves with deep indignation against her, and looked forward with anxious interest to their great ecclesiastical council, which was to be held in eight days, and in which they had determined that the whole matter connected with the murder and her imprisonment should be debated.

The more that Throckmorton investigated the state of parties during this interval, the more he became convinced of the hopelessness of his own interference, and the imminent peril of Mary. So far were the people from listening with any patience to the doctrines of passive obedience, which Elizabeth had instructed him to inculcate, that they took their stand on the very opposite ground, the responsibility of the prince, and the power of the nation to call their sovereign to account for any crimes she might have committed. "It is a public speech among all the people (so wrote the ambassador to Elizabeth), that their queen hath no more liberty nor privilege to commit murder nor adultery, than any other private person, neither by God's laws nor by the laws of the

realm.”¹ These popular principles were now for the first time openly and powerfully preached to the commons. Knox, Craig, and the other ministers of the Reformed Church, considered the pulpit and the press as the lawful vehicles of their political as well as their religious opinions, and the celebrated Buchanan, who had joined the confederates, enforced the same doctrines with uncommon vigour and ability. Their arguments were grounded on the examples of wicked princes in the Old Testament who were deposed and put to death for their idolatry, and on alleged but disputable precedents in their own history of similar severity exercised by subjects against their sovereigns.² In consequence of all these efforts, the few friends who had at first ventured to defend the Scottish queen were silenced and intimidated, and the public mind became inflamed to such a state of madness and fury, that she began to think of saving her life by retiring to a nunnery in France, or living with the old Duchess of Guise.³

At this moment Robert Melvil was for the third time sent by the confederates to Lochleven, instructed to make a last effort to prevail upon his mistress to renounce Bothwell. By him Throkmorton found an opportunity to convey a letter, in which he

¹ Throkmorton to Elizabeth, July 18, 1567. Robertson, Appendix, No. XXII.

² Ibid.

³ St. P. Off. Throkmorton to the Queen, July 16, 1567. Printed by Laing, vol. ii. p. 122.

strongly urged Mary to the same course.¹ But the mission was completely unsuccessful. The queen, who believed herself to be with child, declared her firm resolution rather to die than desert her husband, and declare her child illegitimate. She requested Melvil, at the same time, to deliver a letter to the lords which implored them to have consideration of her health, and to change the place of her imprisonment to Stirling, where she might have the comfort of seeing her son. She was willing, she said, to commit the government of the realm, either to the Earl of Murray alone, or to a council of the nobility, and proposed, that if they would not obey her as their queen, they should regard her with some favour as the mother of their prince, and the daughter of their king. To this interview between Mary and Melvil no one was admitted, and before he took his leave she produced a letter, requesting him to convey it to Bothwell. This he peremptorily refused, upon which she threw it angrily into the fire.²

On his return to the capital, he found the animosity against the queen at its height, and the English ambassador in despair of being able to restrain it from some fatal excess. Many openly declared that no power, either within or without the realm, should preserve her from that signal punishment which her notorious crimes deserved.

¹ Robert Melvil's Declaration. Hopetoun MSS. Throk Morton to the Queen, July 18, 1567. Robertson, Appendix, No. XXII.

² Melvil's Declaration. Hopetoun MSS.

Others, more moderate, proposed to restore her to the royal dignity, if she consented to divorce Bothwell; some advised that she should resign in favour of the prince, who might govern by a council, whilst she retired for life to France. This was Athol's scheme, and not disliked by Morton, but to the majority of the privy council it was unacceptable. They deemed it indispensable that Mary should be publicly arraigned and condemned to perpetual imprisonment as guilty of the king's murder, whilst some went so far as to insist that she should not only be condemned and degraded, but put to death.¹

When such was the state of public feeling, the General Assembly of the Church convened in Edinburgh.² The Protestant clergy had already entered into a strict coalition with Morton and the lords of the Secret Council, who now held the whole power of the government, and the proceedings of their ecclesiastical tribunal partook of the rigorous and uncompromising character of Knox and Buchanan, its leaders. It was argued that the queen was guilty of crimes for which she ought to forfeit her life, and there seemed to be every probability that this dreadful result was about to take place, had it not been for the interference of Throckmorton, who, with the utmost earnestness,

¹ Caligula, C. i. fol. 18. MS. Letter, Throckmorton to Elizabeth, July 19, 1567.

² MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Robert Melvil to Elizabeth, Edinburgh, July 29, 1567.

remonstrated against such an extremity.¹ After violent debates, a more moderate course was adopted. Mary had (as we have seen), already intimated her readiness to resign the government to the Earl of Murray. It was now resolved to follow up the idea, and for this purpose, Lord Lindsay, who had left Lochleven to attend the General Assembly, was despatched thither in company with Robert Melvil. From this nobleman, one of the fiercest zealots of his party, Mary had every thing to dread: her passionate menace to him on the day she was taken prisoner at Carberry had not been forgotten, and he was now selected as a man whom she would hardly dare to resist. He carried with him three instruments drawn up by the Lords in their sovereign's name. By the first she was made to demit the government of the realm in favour of her son, and to give orders for his immediate coronation. By the second, she, in consequence of his tender infancy, constituted her "dear brother," the Earl of Murray, Regent of the realm, and by the third she appointed the duke, with the Earls of Lennox, Argyle, Athol, Morton, Glencairn, and Mar, regents of the kingdom till the return of Murray from France, with power to continue in that high office, if he refused it.²

Before Lindsay was admitted, Melvil had a pri-

¹ MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Robert Melvil to Elizabeth. Edinburgh, 29th July, 1567.

² Anderson, vol. ii. pp. 208-220 inclusive.

vate interview with the queen, and assured her that her refusal to sign the papers would endanger her life. Nor was this going too far. It is certain, that had she proved obstinate the lords were resolved to bring her to a public trial; that they spoke with the utmost confidence of her conviction for the king's murder, and affirmed that they possessed proof of her guilt in her own handwriting.¹ These threats and assertions were in all probability communicated to his royal mistress by Melvil; and he insinuated that she ought to be the less scrupulous, as any deed signed in captivity, and under fear of her life, was invalid. He brought a message to the same purpose from Athol and Lethington, and a letter from Throkmorton.

It was a trying moment for Mary; and for a short time she resisted every intreaty, declaring passionately that she would sooner renounce her life than her crown; but when Lindsay was admitted, his stern demeanour at once terrified her into compliance. He laid the instruments before her, and with eyes filled with tears, and a trembling hand she took the pen and signed the papers without even reading their contents.² It was necessary, however, that they should pass the privy seal, and here a new outrage was committed. The keeper, Thomas Sinclair, remonstrated, and declared that the queen being in ward, her resignation was ineffectual; Lindsay attacked his house,

¹ MS. Letter, Throkmorton to Cecil, 25 July, 1567. *Caligula*, C. I. f. 22.

² Spottiswood, p. 211.

tore the seal from his hands, and compelled him by threats and violence to affix it to the resignation.¹

Having been so far successful, the lords hurried on the consummation of their plans, and resolved without delay to crown the prince, requesting Throk Morton's presence at the ceremony, and dispatching Sir James Melvil to invite the Hamiltons. The English ambassador, however, gave a peremptory refusal. Their whole proceedings, he said, had been contrary to the advice, and in contempt of the remonstrances of his mistress.² The Hamiltons also declined; not, as they commissioned Melvil to inform the confederate lords, on the ground of their being enemies; so far from this they thanked them for their gentle message, but simply because, from the first, they had been made no party to their intentions. It was their wish also, they said, to present a protest, that this coronation should not be prejudicial to the title of the Duke of Chastelherault as next heir to the crown; and their request having been granted, they professed to offer no opposition.³

It was determined that the coronation should be held in the High Church at Stirling, and thither

¹ We owe the discovery of this fact to Mr. Riddell, in a paper published in "Blackwood's Magazine," for October, 1817.

² Throk Morton to Elizabeth, Edinburgh, 26 July, 1567. Stevenson's Selections, illustrating the reign of Mary Queen of Scotland, p. 251. The Original is in the St. P. Off.

³ Throk Morton to Elizabeth, Edinburgh, 31 July, 1567. Stevenson's Selections, p. 258.

the confederate lords repaired ; but on their arrival a collision took place between the new and old opinions. The clergy, of whom Knox was the great leader, insisted that the king should not be anointed, but simply crowned, anointing being a Jewish rite, and abrogated by the gospel dispensation. Against this notion it was argued that the custom was not a superstitious relic, but an ancient solemnity recognised by the general usage of Christendom ; and after a bitter contest, the objection was overruled, and the ceremonial proceeded, every endeavour having been made on the part of the lords to make it as solemn and magnificent as possible. In the procession Athol bore the crown, Morton the sceptre, and Glencairn the sword, whilst Mar, his governor, carried the infant prince in his arms into the church. The deeds of resignation by the queen were read ; and Lindsay, and Ruthven, on their oath testified that they were voluntary. Knox then preached the sermon, the crown was placed on the king's head by the Bishop of Orkney, Morton laying his hand on the Gospels, took the oaths on behalf of his sovereign, that he should maintain the reformed religion and extirpate heresy ; the lords swore allegiance, placing their hands on his head ; the burgesses followed, and in conclusion, the Earl of Mar lifted the monarch from the throne and carried him back to his nursery in the castle.¹ At night, in the

¹ Throk Morton to Elizabeth, Edinburgh, 31 July, 1567, Stevenson, p. 257. Calderwood, MS. Hist. p. 684. Ayscough, 4735.

capital, the blaze of bonfires, and universal mirth and dancing attested the joy of the people.¹

A more extraordinary revolution was perhaps never completed without bloodshed, and apparently with such disproportionate means. A small section of the nobles and the gentry, unsupported by foreign aid, with a handful of soldiers,² at no time exceeding four hundred men, opposed by the highest of the aristocracy, and threatened with the hostility of England and France, were seen to rise with appalling suddenness and strength. They dispel their enemies; they imprison their sovereign; they hesitate whether she shall not be openly arraigned and executed; they compel her to resign her regal authority; and they now, finally, place the crown on the head of her son, an infant of a year old, and possess themselves of the whole power of the government. If we look for the cause of this extraordinary success, it is to be traced chiefly, if not altogether, to the unhappy infatuation and imprudence of the queen. It was this that separated her friends, strengthened the hands of her enemies, gave ample field for the worst suspicions, and alienated from her the hearts and sympathy of the people. But to return.

The first intelligence of these events was received with the utmost indignation by Elizabeth. She had already instructed Throckmorton to remonstrate with the lords, she had warned him to

¹ Throckmorton to Elizabeth, July 31, 1567.

² By "soldiers," is here meant regular *waged* troops.

beware of giving his presence or countenance to the coronation. She now interdicted him from holding any farther intercourse, as her ambassador, with men who had treated her with such discourtesy and contempt, and declared "that she would make herself a party against them to the revenge of their sovereign, and an example to all posterity."¹

When her letters were delivered, the principal leaders, Morton, Mar, Glencairn, Hume and Lethington, had come to Edinburgh, to await the arrival of Murray, to whom they had dispatched an envoy, informing him of his having been chosen regent. Throckmorton, in obedience to his mistress's commands, kept aloof; but Tullibardin, the controller, and brother-in-law to the Earl of Mar, one of the *interim* regents, volunteered a visit; and in the course of conversation on the late events, unveiled a scene of treachery upon the part of the Hamiltons, who had hitherto supported the queen, which filled him with horror. The two great leaders of this party were the Archbishop of St. Andrew's, and the Abbot of Kilwinning; and when the English ambassador remonstrated upon the violence of the recent proceedings, and threatened the lords of the secret council with hostility upon the part of Elizabeth, he was solemnly assured that a perseverance in such a course, was the certain way to shorten Mary's life. Within the last forty-eight hours, said

¹ Orig. Draft, St. P. Off. Instructions to Sir N. Throckmorton, 27 July, 1567. It is corrected in Cecil's hand.

the comptroller, the Archbishop of St. Andrew's, on the part of the Hamiltons, has proposed to us to put the queen to death. They have recommended this course as the only certain method of reconciling all parties; and on our consenting to adopt it, they are ready to join us to a man, and to bring Argile and Huntly along with them.

Throkmorton at first expressed his utter disbelief that any men who had hitherto borne a fair character could be guilty of such atrocious and cold-blooded treachery. He argued also on the point of expediency, that more profit might be made of the queen's life than of her death. She might be divorced from Bothwell and afterwards marry a son of the duke's, or a brother of Argile's. To this Tullibardin's answer was remarkable. "My lord ambassador," said he, "these matters you speak of have been in question amongst them, but now they see not so good an *outgait*¹ by any of those devices as by the queen's death. For she being taken away, they account but the little king betwixt them and home,² who may die. They love not the queen, and they know she hath no great fancy to any of them, and they fear her the more, because she is young and may have many children, which is the thing they would be rid of."³

¹ Outgait—outlet.

² The Hamiltons were nearest heirs to the Crown, failing Mary and her son. *Home* here means the succession to the throne.

³ MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Throkmorton to Elizabeth, Edinburgh, 9 August, 1567.

Throkmorton, however, persevered in his incredulity, and that same evening the secretary Lethington held a secret conference with him, in which he assured him that Tullibardin had stated nothing but the truth. I think it right as these are new facts in this part of our history, involving a charge of unwonted perfidy even in this age, to give the particulars of this extraordinary conversation in the words of the ambassador to Elizabeth. “The same day,” said he, (he is describing the events of the 7th of August) “the Lord of Lethington came to visit me on behalf of all the lords. He demanded of me when I heard from your majesty, and what was the matter why I had sent to Stirling for audience. * * I answered, to let the lords and him understand what your majesty did think of their rash proceedings, finding the matter very strange in this hasty sort to proceed with a queen, their sovereign, being a prince anointed, not having imparted their intent to your majesty. * * *

“For answer, the Laird of Lethington said, ‘My Lord Ambassador, these lords did think their cause could suffer no delays, and as for imparting their purposes to the queen’s Majesty your sovereign, they doubted that neither she would allow that which was meet for them to do, neither could take any of their doings in good part. And where you have charged us with deprivation of the queen from her royal estate, it doth appear by such instruments as I sent you from Stirling, that we have not denuded the queen of her regality, but she hath voluntarily relinquished the same to her

son.' "I asked him," continued Throk Morton, "what free will there might be, or uncompulsory consent, for a prisoner, and such a one as every day looked for to lose her life?" "Yea," said he, "it is you that seek to bring it to pass, what show soever the queen, your mistress, or you, do make to save her life, or set her at liberty. For the Hamiltons and you concur together; you have nothing in your mouths but liberty, and nothing less in your hearts. My Lord Ambassador, (he continued), I have heard what you have said unto me, I assure you, if you should use this speech unto them, which you do unto me, all the world could not save the queen's life three days to an end; and as the case now standeth, it will be much ado to save her life.'

"I said, 'My Lord of Lethington, if you remember, I told you, at my first coming hither, when I understood you minded the coronation of her son, that when you had touched her dignity, you would touch her life shortly after. * * * 'Well, my Lord,' said he, 'I trust you do not take me to be one that doth thirst my sovereign's blood, or that would stain my conscience with the shedding of the same. You know how I have proceeded with you since your coming hither. I have given you the best advice I could to prevent extremity, and either the queen, your sovereign, will not be advised, or you do forbear to advise her. I say unto you, as I am a Christian man, if we which have dealt in this action would consent to take the queen's life from her, all the lords which hold out and lie aloof from

us, would come and conjoin with us within these two days. This morning the Bishop of St. Andrew's, and the Abbot of Kilwinning, have sent a gentleman unto us for that purpose. And likewise the Earl of Huntly hath sent Duncan Forbes, within this hour, to conclude with us upon the same ground, and to be plain with you, there be very few amongst ourselves which be of any other opinion.' "

Throk Morton then began to use persuasions to dissuade them from such a fearful extremity. Upon which Lethington assured him, that, as far as he himself was concerned, there needed no argument — but he added, emphatically, "How can you satisfy men that the queen shall not become a dangerous party against them in case she live and come to liberty." I said, "Divorce her from Bothwell." He said, "We cannot bring it to pass; she will in no wise hear of the matter." The conversation was then broken off by Sir James Balfour coming in to carry Lethington to the council, who were waiting for him.¹

It is clear, then, that at this moment the Hamiltons, instead of being friends to the unhappy queen, as they are represented in our popular historians, were acting towards her with treachery and cruelty; they were ready to sacrifice her to their own dreams of ambition,² and the life of Mary was in the most

¹ MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Throk Morton to Elizabeth, 9th August, 1567.

² MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Throk Morton to Leicester, Edinburgh, 9th August, 1567.

imminent peril.¹ The remonstrances and arguments of Throk Morton, however, so far prevailed, that it was agreed the fatal blow should be suspended till the arrival of the Earl of Murray.

To this remarkable man, on whose movements so much depended, all eyes were now turned, and his future conduct became the subject of much discussion. He had been elected regent. Would he accept this high office, which, considering the divided state of parties, brought with it so many difficulties? What were his sentiments as to the extraordinary events which had lately taken place? The deposition and captivity of his sovereign, the coronation of the prince, the remonstrances of England, the efforts of France, above all, the guilt and punishment of the queen, now so strongly urged by that party of the Reformed Church with whom he had hitherto acted? All this was field for fearful conjecture to some—for anxious speculation to all; and Murray's was a character not easily fathomed, which often concealed purposes of great weight and determination under a blunt and open manner. He had now been absent from Scotland for nearly four months, and it is certain, that when

¹ Keith, p. 436, has fallen into the error of representing the band or agreement of the party of the Hamiltons at Dumbar-ton, as having been entered into about the 29th July, instead of the 29th June, which is its true date, as seen on the original instrument in the St. P. Off. In Mr. Dawson Turner's volume of MS. Scottish letters, there is a copy of the same deed, with the correct date 29th June.

Morton and the lords of the Secret Council first planned that revolution (14th May), which ended so fatally to Mary, they had secretly communicated with him. The exact nature of that communication we know not, but it was reported that he approved of their designs, and a month later, after the imprisonment of the queen, they again entered into correspondence with him; once more, about a fortnight later, and once again, after the resignation of the queen, this correspondence was renewed. These facts are undoubtedly calculated to excite suspicion, and we are not to be surprised, if, in the heat of the controversy which has agitated this portion of our history, it has been argued from them that Murray not only approved of, but directed all the plans of the conspirators. But the enquirer after truth dares not advance so rapidly. All that is proved amounts to the fact, that the lords of the confederacy against Mary, from the first, were anxious to gain him. Indeed, his election to the regency showed how far they were ready to go to secure him—but of his answers to their letters we know nothing. It is also worthy of remark, that on the only occasion when we can detect a message sent to them by Murray, it was hostile to his reputed friends. Elphinston, whom we have seen deputed by him to communicate with his imprisoned mistress and her captors, brought an assurance of such comfort and loyalty to Mary, and so severe a remonstrance to the lords, that they interdicted him from seeing the queen until they had

made up their minds to depose her or to put her to death. Such a message could not have proceeded from an associate.

On being informed of his election to the regency, Murray prepared to leave France, and his intentions at this moment formed an object of the deepest interest to the court of England, and the Tuileries. Elizabeth was naturally anxious to preserve the influence she had hitherto exerted in the affairs of Scotland. She considered her hold over the measures of that country as an essential part of the great system for the support of Protestantism in Europe. At the same time, however, she was highly incensed at the lords of the secret council for their deposition of their sovereign: their conduct, in her opinion, was insulting to the majesty of the crown, and destructive of all principles of good government, and as she had determined to exert herself to procure the liberty of the captive queen, she was anxious to secure Murray in the same service. Such were the feelings of Elizabeth.

The court of France on the other hand, was equally anxious to preserve or rather to recover the influence it once held over Scotland, and at first the king declared that he would strain every effort to have Mary and the prince brought into his kingdom—but this idea was soon abandoned. The Scottish queen had never been a favourite with the queen mother, and provided they gained the confederate lords, in whose hands at this moment was the

whole power of the government, and enlisted Murray in their interest, the French soon came to care little whether the queen remained a captive or was set at liberty. High bribes were offered him before his departure, and when he resisted these entreaties, and it began to be rumoured that he leant to the side of England, every impediment was thrown in the way of his return.¹ But such difficulties were overcome by his prudence and firmness. Without binding himself to France in any specific agreement, he assured the king of his desire to use every exertion for the deliverance of his sovereign, and left the court with Monsieur De Lignerolles, who was ordered to accompany him. Of this person the avowed object was, to carry a message from the French king to the lords of the secret council, but his real errand was, to watch the proceedings of the regent elect, and hurry him on to Scotland, without giving him time to communicate with Elizabeth.²

At this moment, when on the eve of leaving France, Murray was informed, probably by Elphinston, his own servant, of the alleged proofs of Mary's guilt, which had been discovered by her enemies in Scotland, his informant stating, that he had seen and read a letter of the Scottish queen to Bothwell,

¹ MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Norris to Cecil, Poissy, 2d July 1567. French Corr: MS. Letter, Orig. St. P. Off. Norris to Cecil, July 16, 1567. French Corr. Also Norris to Elizabeth, July 23, 1567. Stevenson's Selections, p. 243.

² MS. Letter, St. P. Off. French Corr. Norris to Cecil, Paris, July 16, 1567.

which proved that she was privy to her husband's murder.¹ Hitherto the accusations against his sovereign had been vague and unsupported by proof, but if this were true, and if she still obstinately refused to renounce Bothwell, it appeared clear to him that her immediate restoration to liberty was impossible. At the same time this intelligence necessarily worked a change in Murray's feelings more favourable to the confederate lords, and more severe towards his sovereign, so that on his arrival at the English court, his interview with the queen was angry and unsatisfactory: Elizabeth expressed herself determined to restore the imprisoned queen, and to punish the audacious subjects who had dethroned her. Against this dictatorial tone, Murray's spirit rose, and the queen, who expected implicit obedience, upbraided him with such severity, that she shook his affection towards England, a result much deplored by Bedford and Throckmorton. These able persons, and her chief minister Cecil, who were intimately acquainted with the state of the two parties, had earnestly enforced on the queen the necessity of leaving Mary to her fate, and encouraging the lords who had deposed her. They considered her cause to be desperate, and and they believed such a course to be the only

¹ Gonzalez Apuntamientos, p. 323. From a Letter of Norris to Cecil. MS. St. P. Off. 23 July, 1567. French Corr. it appears that Murray left the French court at that time. Also Throckmorton to Cecil, Aug. 2, 1567. Stevenson's Selections, p. 263.

likely way to prevent these men from throwing themselves into the arms of the French King, who had made them flattering advances, and was ready to desert the Scottish queen. It was to the honour of Elizabeth that she repudiated this advice, refused to abandon the cause of the captive princess, and perceiving the change in Murray's mind, dismissed him with no kindly feeling.¹

On the 8th of August he reached Berwick, accompanied by De Lignerolles. Here he was the guest of Bedford, his ancient friend and associate, and was met by two envoys from the lords of the confederacy Sir James Makgill, lord clerk register, and the well known Sir James Melvil; the first was the representative of that section who were most determined against the queen, the other was deputed by that more moderate class, who wished to spare her life, and contemplated the possibility of her restitution. Both of these were fully able to inform him of the state of parties, and Makgill, who had been a principal actor in the deposition of his sovereign, and knew all that could be urged against her, explained to him their whole proceedings, and urged the absolute necessity of his accepting the regency. Murray, however, refused to commit himself, and pursuing his journey, was met at the Bound Rode, the line which separates the two countries, by a troop of four hundred noblemen and gentlemen

¹ MS. Letter, St. P. Off. B. C. Bedford to Cecil, 10th Aug. 1567. Also 14 Aug. 1567. B. C. Bedford to Cecil. Also MS. Letter, St. P. Off. B. C. 1st Aug. 1567. Bedford to Cecil.

who had assembled to honour his arrival. From thence he rode to Whittingham.

It was only a year and a half before, that in this fatal house the conference had been held between Lethington, Bothwell, and Morton, in which the king's murder was determined. Bothwell was now a fugitive and an outlaw, but his associates in guilt, the same Lethington and Morton, now received Murray at Whittingham, and cordially sympathised with him, when he expressed his horror for the crime, and his resolution to avenge it.

After a night's rest, the regent elect proceeded to the capital, which he entered next day, surrounded by the nobility, and amid the acclamations of the citizens. Here for two days he employed himself unremittingly in examining the state of the two factions, holding consultations with his friends, and acquiring the best information as to the difficulties he might have to encounter in accepting the high office which was offered him. He had already held an interview with Throckmorton, the English ambassador, who met him for this purpose a few miles from Edinburgh, and to this able judge, who had no interest to blind him, Murray appeared to be acting with sincerity and honour—he was already aware of the general nature of De Lignerolles' message to the lords of the confederacy, and in the secret consultations which he held with these persons, the whole history of their proceedings must have been laid before him. From them he now learnt the full extent of Mary's infatu-

ation and alleged guilt ; the proofs and letters which, as they asserted, convicted her of participation in her husband's murder, were now, no doubt, imparted to him, and he was made aware of the stern determination which many of them had embraced, of bringing her to a public trial, and if convicted, putting her to death. As to the difficulties of his situation, the faction of the Hamiltons and the hostility of Elizabeth were the principal obstacles in his way ; but the first were divided in their councils, and the English queen would soon, he trusted, be induced by Cecil to remove her opposition. On the whole, he felt almost resolved to accept the regency, but one point made him still hesitate. The demission of the crown, the deeds which nominated himself, and sanctioned the coronation of the prince, were said to have been extorted from Mary. If true, this would vitiate his title to the office, and he requested permission to see the queen in Lochleven before he gave his final answer. This demand startled the lords, and some thought it would be injudicious to grant it. To Throk Morton, the English ambassador, he had expressed himself with great commiseration towards the captive princess, and they dreaded the consequences of his pity or sympathy.

At last, however, they consented, and on the 15th of August, Murray, in company with Morton, Athol, and Lord Lindsay, visited the queen in her prison. It was a remarkable and affecting interview. Mary received them with tears, and pas-

sionately complained of her wrongs. Then taking Murray aside, before supper, she eagerly questioned him as to the intentions of the lords, and in vain endeavoured to fathom his own. Contrary to his usual open and frank demeanour, he was gloomy, silent, and reserved. When the bitter meal had past, she again spoke to him in private, and torn by fear and suspense, pathetically described her sufferings. He was her brother, she said, her only friend, he must know her fate, for he was all-powerful with her enemies; would he now withhold his counsel and assistance in this extremity of her sorrow? What was she to look for? She knew some thirsted for her blood. In the end she implored him to keep her no longer in doubt, but to speak out, and even were it to criminate her, to use all freedom and plainness.¹

Thus urged, Murray without mitigation or disguise, laid before her the whole history of her misgovernment, using a severity of language, and earnestness of rebuke, more suited (to use a phrase of Throkmorton's) to a ghostly confessor than a counsellor; her ill-advised marriage with Darnley, her hasty love, her sudden estrangement, the dark scene of his murder, the manifest guilt of Bothwell, his pretended trial, his unjust acquittal, her infatuated passion, her shameless marriage, her obstinate adherence to the murderer, the hatred of her subjects, her capture, her imprisonment, the

¹ Throkmorton to the queen, Aug. 20, 1567. Keith, p. 444.

allegations of the lords that they could convict her by her own letters, of being accessory to the murder, their determination to bring her to a public trial, and to put her to an ignominious death; all these points were insisted on, with a severity and plainness, to which the queen had seldom been accustomed, and the dreadful picture plunged the unhappy sufferer into an agony of despair. Throughout the dismal recital, she interrupted him by extenuations, apologies, confessions, and sometimes by denials. The conversation had been prolonged till past midnight, and Mary weeping and clinging to the hope of life, again and again implored her brother's protection: but Murray was unmoved, or at least he judged it best to seem so, and retired to his chamber, bidding her seek her chief refuge in the mercy of God.¹

Next morning at an early hour she sent for him, and perceiving the impression he had made, he assumed a milder mood, threw in some words of consolation, and assured her that, whatever might be the conduct of others, to save her life he was ready to sacrifice his own, but unfortunately the decision lay not with him alone, but with the lords, the church, and the people. Much also depended on herself; if she attempted an escape, intrigued to bring in the French or the English, and thus disturbed the quiet government of her son, or continued in her inordinate affection to Bothwell,

¹ Ibid. ut supra.

she need not expect to live ; if she deplored her past sins, showed an abhorrence for the murder of her husband, and repented her former life with Bothwell, then might he hold out great hope that those in whose power she now lay would spare her life. As to her liberty, he said in conclusion, that was at present out of the question. He had as yet only a single voice in the state, like other nobles, it was therefore not in his power to procure it, nor would it be for her interest at this moment to desire it. It was Mary's weakness (in the present case we can hardly call it such) to be hurried away by impulses. She had passed the night under the dreadful conviction that her fate was decided, that she had but a short time to live. She now discerned a gleam of hope, and, starting from her seat, took Murray in her arms, and urged him to accept the regency, as the best and safest course for herself, her son, and her kingdom. He declined it, she again pressed it on him, he gave his reasons against undertaking so arduous a task. She replied, and insisted, that the service of his sovereign and his country ought to outweigh every selfish motive. He at last assented ; the queen then suggested that his first efforts should be directed to get all the forts into his hands, and requested him to take her jewels, and other articles of value, into his custody, as her only way of preserving them. On taking leave, she embraced and kissed him, with tears, and sent by him her blessing to her son. Murray then turned to Lindsay and Lochleven, and recommending them to treat

their royal mistress with all gentleness, left the castle.¹

Having thus effected his purpose with much address, and some little duplicity, Murray and his companions repaired to Stirling to visit the prince. Here they remained until the evening of the 19th of August, when they returned to the capital, and on the 22nd, he was solemnly declared Regent. The ceremony of his inauguration was held in the council chamber, within the Tolbooth, where in presence of the lords of the secret council, the nobility, spirituality, and commissioners of burghs, the instruments granted by the queen were publicly read. After this, the earl delivered an oration, in which he alluded to his own unfitness for so high an office, accepted the charge, and took the oath with his hand upon the gospels. He swore that to the utmost of his power he would serve God, according to his holy word revealed in the New and Old Testament, that he would maintain the true religion as it was then received within that realm, that he would govern the people according to the ancient and loveable laws of the kingdom; procure peace, repress all wrong, maintain justice and equity, and root out from the realm all heretics and enemies to the true church of God.² He was then proclaimed amid universal acclamations, at the Cross of Edinburgh, and throughout all the counties and burghs

¹ Throk Morton to the Queen. August 20th, 1567. Brit. Mus. Caligula, C. 1. fol. xxviii. Printed by Keith, p. 444.

² Anderson's Collections, vol. ii., pp. 252, 253.

of the kingdom. Information of this event was instantly sent to the Earl of Bedford at Berwick, who next day, communicated it to Cecil.¹

¹ Bedford to Cecil, MS. Letter, St. P. Off. B.C. Aug. 23, 1567, Berwick. Also Throckmorton to Cecil, Aug. 23, 1567. Stevenson's Selections, p. 289.

CHAP. III.

1567 - 1569.

Regency of the Earl of Murray.

CONTEMPORARY PRINCES.

<i>England.</i>	<i>France.</i>	<i>Germany.</i>	<i>Spain.</i>	<i>Portugal.</i>	<i>Pope.</i>
Elizabeth.	Charles IX.	Maximilian II	Philip II.	Sebastian.	Pius VI.

IMMEDIATELY after his acceptance of the government, Murray invited Throk Morton to a conference. He obeyed, and found the regent and secretary Lethington sitting together, upon which he conveyed to them “in as earnest and vehement a form as he could set it forth,” the queen his mistress’ severe disapproval of their recent conduct. To this remonstrance, Maitland made a bold reply. He renounced for himself and his colleagues, all intention of harm to the person and honour of his royal mistress in their late proceedings. “So far from it,” said he, “Mr. Ambassador, that we wish her to be queen of all the world ; but now she is in the state of a person in the delirium of a fever, who refuses every thing which may do her good, and requires all that may work her harm. Be assured nothing will be more pre-

judicial to her interest, than for your mistress to precipitate matters. It may drive us to a strait, and compel us to measures we would gladly avoid. Hitherto have we been content to be charged with grievous and infamous titles, we have quietly suffered ourselves to be condemned as perjured rebels and unnatural traitors, rather than proceed to anything that might touch our sovereign's honour. But beware we beseech you, that your mistress, by her continual threats and defamations, by hostility, or by soliciting other princes to attack us, do not push us beyond endurance. Think not we will lose our lives, forfeit our lands, and be challenged as rebels throughout the world, when we have the means to justify ourselves. And if there be no remedy, but your mistress will have war, sorry though we be, far rather will we take our fortune, than put our queen to liberty in her present mood, resolved as she is to retain and defend Bothwell, to hazard the life of her son, to peril the realm, and to overthrow her nobility.”¹

“For your wars,” he continued, “we know them well. You will burn our borders, and we shall burn yours ; if you invade us, we do not dread it, and are sure of France ; for your practices to nourish dissension amongst us, we have an eye upon them all. The Hamiltons will take your money, laugh you to scorn, and side with us. At this moment we have the offer of an agreement with them in

¹ Throckmorton to Elizabeth, Aug. 22, 1567. Keith, p. 448.

our hands. The queen, your mistress, declares she wishes not only for our sovereign's liberty, and her restoration to her dignity, but is equally zealous for the preservation of the king, the punishment of the murder, and the safety of the lords. To accomplish the first, our queen's liberty, much has been done, for the rest, absolutely nothing. Why does not her majesty fit out some ships of war, to apprehend Bothwell, and pay a thousand soldiers to reduce the forts and protect the king. When this is in hand, we shall think her sincere, but for her charge to set our sovereign forthwith at liberty, and restore her to her dignity, it is enough to reply to such strange language, that we are the subjects of another prince, and know not the queen's majesty for our sovereign."¹

As soon as Lethington had concluded, Throckmorton turning to Murray, expressed a hope that such sentiments would at least not meet his approval. He was not "banded" with these lords, he had committed none of their excesses. But Murray was now secure, he had little to fear from Elizabeth, nothing from France, and his answer was as decided, though more laconic than the secretary's. "Truly, my lord ambassador," said he, "methinks you have had reason at the Laird of Lethington's hands. It is true, that I have not been at the past doings of these lords, yet I must commend what they have done; and seeing the

¹ Throckmorton to Elizabeth, Aug. 22, 1567, printed by Keith, p. 448, from Orig. Caligula, C. 1, fol. xxxii.

queen my sovereign and they have laid on me the charge of the regency, a burden I would gladly have avoided, I am resolved to maintain their action, and will reduce all men to obedience in the king's name, or it shall cost me my life."¹

The ambassador had been long aware that his further stay in Scotland would be totally useless. He had earnestly solicited his recal ; and Elizabeth now agreed to it, but ordered him first to make a last remonstrance in favour of the captive queen, and to request to be admitted to her presence. This, as he had looked for, was peremptorily refused by Murray. They had excluded De Lignerolles, the French ambassador, he said, who had so lately left them ; and it was impossible to admit him : for the rest of his message from the queen of England, the regent, after his usual fashion, replied to it with great brevity ; as to his acceptance of the government the deed was done ; for calumny he cared little, and would use none other defence than a good conscience and a sincere intention ; to satisfy the queen that his mistress had consented, he could only say, that he had her own word and signature ; for her liberty, its being granted depended upon accidents ; and as to her condition after Bothwell's apprehension, it would be idle, he said, to bargain for the bear's skin before they had him. The ambassador before he took his leave, was pressed to accept a present of plate in the name of the king. This was declined in strong terms, and

¹ Ibid. ut supra.

on the 29th of August, he left the capital for England.

Murray now addressed himself with characteristic decision and courage to the cares of government; and to use Throk Morton's expressive phrase, "went stoutly to work, resolved rather to imitate those who had led the people of Israel than any captains of that age."¹ He instantly despatched the Laird of Grange, and Murray of Tullibardin, with three armed ships in pursuit of Bothwell, who, after lurking in the north, and in vain attempting to make a party in these remote districts, had fled to Orkney and turned pirate.² He next employed the most vigorous measures to compel the whole kingdom to acknowledge the king's government; to secure himself against attack if Elizabeth should meditate it, and to keep up pacific relations with France, which, from the tone all along assumed by De Lignerolles, he was assured would not be difficult. The Hamiltons had made some feeble attempts to prevent the regent being proclaimed within their bounds; but they acted with no fixed plan, had no leader of ability, and gave him little anxiety.³

¹ Throk Morton to Cecil, Aug. 20, 1567, in Stevenson's *Selections*, p. 282.

² Throk Morton to Cecil, August 26, 1567, Stevenson's *Selections*, p. 294. Also MS. Letter, St. P. Off. B. C. Bedford to Cecil, Berwick, Sept. 11, 1567.

³ Throk Morton to the Queen, Aug. 23, 1567. Stevenson's *Selections*, p. 291.

A large proportion of the nobles who had hitherto been hostile or neutral now sent in their adherence to his government; and Sir James Balfour, the governor of the castle of Edinburgh, delivered that fortress into his hands. This infamous man was the intimate friend of Bothwell, and a principal actor in the king's murder. It might have been expected that Murray, who had lately expressed so much horror for that deed, and so determined a resolution to avenge it, would have been the last to overlook the crime in one of the principal conspirators; but like other ambitious men, he could make his conscience give way to his interest, as the treaty in question completely proved. Its first stipulation was, that Balfour should have an ample remission as an accomplice in the murder; the next, that before he gave up the keys of the castle, five thousand pounds should be paid down; the last, that he himself should have the Priory of Pittenweem, and his son an annuity. All this was agreed to, apparently without difficulty, and only two days after his assuming the regency, Murray in person took possession of the castle.¹

As if to cover the shame of this transaction, the regent made unusual exertions to seize some of the inferior delinquents. Previous to his arrival in Scotland, Captain Blacater had been taken and executed. He now apprehended John Hay of Tallo, a page of the king's called Durham, Black John

¹ MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Throckmorton to Cecil, Aug. 26, 1567. History of James the Sext, p. 18.

bring back the murderer or lose his life in the attempt; but, in giving chase, Grange's ship, one of the largest in the Scottish navy, struck upon a sand-bank, and although he boarded and brought home with him one of Bothwell's vessels, the earl himself, in a lighter craft, escaped to Norway. In one respect the expedition was important, as Hepburn of Bolton, an accomplice in the king's murder, was seized in the ship, and, by his confession, threw additional light on that dark transaction. For the present, however, his revelations were not suffered to be known.¹

Murray now summoned a Parliament (Dec. 15), the proceedings of which evince the new regent's complete connexion and sympathy with the party of the Reformed Church, and demand especial attention. It has been asserted that it was thinly attended, but the remark can only apply to the bishops, who represented the ecclesiastical estate, of whom but four appeared, Murray, Galloway, Orkney, and Brechin. There were present, however, fourteen abbots, twelve earls, sixteen lords and masters, the name given to lords' eldest sons, and twenty-seven commissioners of burghs.² The discussions were opened in a speech by Lethington, of which a copy still remains in his own handwri-

¹ MS. Letter, St. P. Off. 11th Sept. 1567. Murray to Cecil. Also Melvil's *Memoirs*, p. 186. Also 16th Sept. MS. Letter, B.C. Bedford to Cecil.

² Anderson, vol. ii. pp. 228, 229, 230. Also MS. St. P. Off. Dec. 15, 1567.

ting, and it were to be wished that its truth and sincerity had been equal to its talent. He alluded to the vast importance of the crisis in which they met, and the subjects upon which they were about to legislate, any one of which would, he said, have been enough to have occupied a parliament. These were the establishing a uniform religion, the acknowledgment of the just authority of the king in consequence of the queen's free demission of the crown in his favour, the sanction to be given to the appointment of a regent chosen to act in the king's minority, the reuniting the minds of the nobility, the punishment of the cruel murder of the late king, their sovereign's father, and many other disorders requiring the grave consideration of their lordships. Upon these heads, he said, he would not dilate, but two points he must not omit, both tending to their great comfort, and calling for deep gratitude. The first was, the success which in matters of religion had followed such comparatively small beginnings. The second, their happy fortune in having in the regent a nobleman so excellently qualified to carry their ordinances into execution, whether they related to the church or the commonwealth. "As to religion," said he, "the quietness you presently enjoy, declares sufficiently the victory that God by his word has obtained among you, within the space of eight or nine years; how feeble the foundation was in the eyes of men, how unlikely it was to rise so suddenly to so large and huge a greatness, with what calmness the work has pro-

ceeded, not one of you is ignorant. Iron has not been heard within the house of the Lord, that is to say, the whole has been builded, set up, and erected to this greatness without bloodshed. Note it I pray you, as a singular testimony of God's favour, and a peculiar benefit granted only to the realm of Scotland, not as the most worthy, but chosen out by His providence from among all nations, for causes hid and unknown to us, and to foreshow His almighty power, that the true religion has obtained a free course universally throughout the whole realm, and yet not a Scotsman's blood shed in the forthsetting of the whole quarrel. With what nation in the earth has God dealt so mercifully? Consider the progress of religion from time to time in other countries, Germany, Denmark, England, France, Flanders, or where you please. You shall find the lives of many thousands spent before they could purchase the tenth part of that liberty whereunto we have attained, as it were sleeping upon down beds."¹

When we recollect the events of the few last years—the rising of Murray against the queen's marriage, the murder of Riccio, the flight of Morton, the assassination of Darnley, the confederacy against Bothwell, and the imprisonment of the queen, all of them events more or less connected with the establishment of the Reformation in Scotland—and remember also that Lethington was

¹ MS. St. P. Off. An Oration of the Lord of Lethington, at the Parliament of Scotland, Dec. 1567.

deeply engaged in them all, it is certainly difficult which most to condemn, the gross inaccuracy of this picture, or the hardihood evinced by its coming from his lips.

But to return to the proceedings of the parliament. The committee of the Lords of the Articles having been chosen,¹ the three estates sanctioned the queen's demission of the crown, the king's coronation, and the appointment of Murray to the regency. The Pope's authority was next abolished, the Act to that effect passed in the disputed Parliament of 1560, being solemnly ratified. All laws repugnant to the word of God were annulled, and the "Confession of Faith," which had been already read and approved of in a former Parliament, was sanctioned and published. All heretics and hearers of mass were made liable to punishment, confiscation of moveables being declared the penalty for the first offence, banishment for the second, and death for the third. Such persons as opposed the Confession of Faith, or refused to receive the sacraments after the Presbyterian form, were declared to be no members of the Church of Christ. The examination and admission of ministers was de-

¹ It was composed of the Bishops of Murray, Galloway, and Orkney, the Abbots of Dumfermling, Melrose, Newbottle, Balmerino, St. Coln's Inch, Pittenweem, and Portmoak, the Earls of Huntly, Argyle, Morton, Athol, Glencairn, Mar, and Caithness, the Lords Hume, Lindsay, and Sempil, with the Provosts of Edinburgh, Dundee, Montrose, Aberdeen, St. Andrew's, Cowper, Stirling, and Ayr.

clared a prerogative inherent in the Church, but to lay patrons was continued the power of presentation, with an appeal to the General Assembly, if their nomination of a qualified person was not sustained by the superintendents and ministers; and, lastly, all kings, at their coronation, or princes, or magistrates acting in their place, were bound to take the oath for the support of the true church and the extirpation of heresy.¹

So far every thing succeeded to the wishes of the reformed clergy, but their endeavour to repossess themselves of the patrimony of the Church was not so fortunate. They pleaded a former promise to this effect, and, if we may credit Bishop Spottiswood, the regent showed an anxiety to fulfil it, but the laymen, who had violently seized the property of the Church when it was in the hands of the Roman Catholic clergy, manifested the same violence now that their own ministers proposed to resume possession, and, with difficulty, consented to restore to them a third of the benefices.² It was next ordered that a reformation should be made in all schools, colleges, and universities, and that no teachers were to be admitted but such as had been examined and approved by the appointed visitors and superintendents, and lastly, that, as far as concerned the preaching of the word, the reformation of man-

¹ Spottiswood, p. 214. Maitland, vol. ii. p. 1006. Black Acts, fol. 1-5, c. 1. 2.

² Id. ut supra, p. 1007.

ners, and the administration of the sacraments, no other ecclesiastical powers should be acknowledged than those which were now claimed by the Presbyterian Church, to which they gave the title of the Immaculate Spouse of Christ.¹

A keen debate arose when the subject of the queen's imprisonment came before the Assembly, which was greatly divided in opinion. Many who were convinced of their sovereign's guilt, and who had adopted the views lately promulgated by the ministers in their pulpit addresses, contended that she should be brought to a public trial, and if the crime was proved, punished by the laws, like any other subject of the realm. To this it was objected that the monarch was the source of all authority, that she could not, without absurdity and contradiction, be made amenable to an inferior jurisdiction, but was accountable for her conduct to God alone. It was replied, that extraordinary crimes required extraordinary remedies; but this doctrine was not generally acceptable. The discussion concluded in a resolution that the imprisonment of the queen should be continued, and an act of Parliament passed for the exoneration of those noblemen and barons who had risen in arms for the prosecution of the murder. The terms of this act, which were nearly similar to a previous resolution of the Privy Council, require a moment's notice, as it is in it that we find the first public mention of

¹ Maitland, vol. ii., p. 1007.

those letters of Mary to Bothwell, which, it was afterwards contended, completely proved her guilt. It declared the conduct and transactions of these lords, from the 10th of February (the day of Darnley's murder), till the present time, to be lawful and loyal; that they should never be subjected to any prosecution for what they had done, because, if the queen were confined, it was solely in consequence of her own fault and demerit, seeing, that by several of her private letters, written wholly with her own hand, and sent by her to Bothwell, and by her ungodly and pretended marriage with him, it was most certain that she was cognizant, art and part, of the murder of the king her husband. This declaration of the Estates having been signed and sealed, and ordered to be printed along with the other statutes, the Parliament was dissolved.¹

It appears, by an act of Privy Council, dated the 16th September, 1568, that the Earl of Morton had, at that time,² delivered to the regent the little box or coffer, with the letters and sonnets which it contained. It was to these letters that the act now quoted referred, and the partial and unjust conduct of Murray and the Parliament

¹ Goodall, vol. ii. pp. 62, 69. The words in the Black Acts. Anderson, vol. ii. p. 221, are, "divers her privie letters written halelie, (wholly) with her own hand. The words of the act of Privy Council are, "divers her privie letters, written and subscribed with her own hand."

² Anderson, vol. ii. p. 257.

need hardly be pointed out. Such documents might or might not be originals, but by every principle of justice, the queen ought not to have been condemned, nor should these letters have been received as evidence of the justice of that condemnation, until she had enjoyed in person, or by her counsel, an opportunity of examining the proofs produced against her. This injustice, however, was little in comparison with another proceeding of Murray's, who, having now tasted the sweets of absolute power, and being determined, at all hazard, to retain it, became little scrupulous of the means which he employed. Sir James Balfour, as we have seen, had been the confidant of Bothwell, and was the depository of the Bond or Contract which was drawn up for the murder of the king. It had been seen by one of the accomplices in the murder, named Ormiston, who affirmed that Bothwell pointed out certain signatures, which he declared to be those of Argile, Huntly, Lethington, and Balfour himself.¹ This profligate adherent of Bothwell's kept the bond along with the queen's jewels and other property of value in the Castle of Edinburgh, which fortress the duke had committed to his charge, but he betrayed the place, as we have seen, to Murray, and, on its delivery, the regent, now all-powerful, might have stipulated for the delivery of all the evidence which threw light upon so foul a plot. In estimating his moral character, which has been highly ex-

¹ Supra, p. 30.

tolled by some writers, it is instructive to mark in what way he appears to have proceeded. The letters alleged to be written by the queen, were preserved, exhibited to the Council, and quoted to the Parliament as proofs of her guilt. Her jewels and other apparel were delivered up by Balfour¹ to Murray, but the "Bond" which connected his friends with the murder, was appropriated by Lethington, committed to the flames, and destroyed for ever. We learn this important fact, which is new in the controversy, from a letter addressed by Drury to Cecil, on the 28th of November, a short time before the meeting of the Parliament. "The writings," said he, "which did comprehend the names and consents of the chief for the murdering of the king, is turned into ashes, the same not unknown to the queen, and the same that concerns her part kept to be shown, which offends her." It is true, there is here no assertion that the regent himself threw the bond into the fire, and it was Lethington's and Balfour's interest, as it criminated themselves, to have it destroyed; but that Murray consented to its destruction, whilst he preserved the evidence against the queen, the whole circumstances appear to me to demonstrate. Drury, in the same letter to Cecil, observed, "that Murray made fair weather with Mary, and was dealing

¹ MS. Letter, St. P. Off. B.C. Bedford to Cecil, Berwick, 5th Sept. 1567. Ibid. Same to same, 11th Sept. 1567. Melvil's *Memoirs*, p. 11. Also MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Randolph to Cecil, Oct. 15, 1570, and MS. St. P. Off. Drury to Cecil, Nov. 28, 1567.

very soundly and uprightly.” Sir William’s ideas as to upright conduct, unless the expression was used solely with reference to the safety assured by the regent to his own associates, must have been peculiar.

Of this partial dealing, he now gave another signal instance in the trial of those delinquents who were in custody for the king’s murder. Their names were Hay of Tallo, John Hepburn of Bolton, George Dalgleish, a page or chamberlain, and William Powrie a servant of Bothwell. It was well known at the time of his being apprehended, that Hay, the confidant of Bothwell, had not only given a full detail of the murder, but had accused some of the highest nobility of being accomplices in it.¹ It was equally notorious, that Captain Cullen who had been employed in his most secret concerns by the chief murderer, had revealed the whole circumstances,² and that the lords and the regent must have been in possession of his confession. So general was the expectation of these disclosures being made public, that Sir William Drury, in writing to Cecil upon the subject, informed him that Tallo’s life had been spared for a little only, until some of the great persons who were acquainted

¹ Bedford to Cecil. MS. Letter, St. P. Off. B. C. Sept. 16, 1567. Also Drury to Cecil, MS. Letter, St. P. Off. B. C. Sept. 30, 1567.

² MS. Letter, St. P. Off. B. C. Drury to Cecil, June 14, 1567. Berwick. Scrope to Cecil, June 16, 1567, Carlisle. MS. Letter, St. P. Off. B. C.

with the cruel deed were apprehended. All therefore looked with intense anxiety to the trial of these men, and it was confidently demanded, that as so much pains had been taken in the recent parliament to criminate the queen, the same care should be employed to discover who else were guilty, that by the publication of the confessions of Cullen, Tallo, and Hepburn, the regent would at length reveal the names of those great accomplices who had hitherto escaped. But Murray had neither the power, nor the will, to make this exposure. The trials were shamefully hurried over. The culprits were arraigned, convicted, and executed in one day (Jan. 3). Although Hepburn of Bolton, in his speech on the scaffold, directly asserted that Argile, Huntly, and Lethington had subscribed to the bond for the murder, no arrest of these persons followed, the judicial confessions which were made by him and his accomplices were suppressed at the time, and when subsequently brought forward to be exhibited in England, it was found that they had been manifestly tampered with, and contained evidence against no one but themselves and Bothwell.¹

These proceedings told strongly against the regent, and making every allowance for the miserable state of the law in these times, it is impossible to exculpate him from the charge of having lent him-

¹ MS. Letter, St. P. Off. B.C. Drury to Cecil, Jan. 4, 1567-8. MS. Letter, St. P. Off. B.C. Drury to Cecil, Jan. 7, 1567-8. Ibid. Forster to Cecil, Alnwick, 11 Jan. 1567-8. Ibid. Drury to Cecil, Berwick, 21st Jan. 1567.

self to a plan for the defeat of justice. Nor does it need any great discernment to discover both the means by which the truth was suppressed, and the motive for such base conduct. Argile was Lord Justice General, the head and fountain of the criminal jurisprudence of the country. By his deputy, the trials were conducted, and Argile was a principal accomplice in the king's murder. The confessions were made before the lords of the privy council, and amongst these lords were Morton, Huntly, Lethington, and Sir James Balfour, all of them parties to the murder. Lastly, Murray was regent of the realm, but he had been placed in the high office by these very men, and his tenure was still so insecure, that a new coalition might have unseated him.

Such conduct, although politic so far as his own greatness was concerned, disappointed the people, and was loudly condemned. Handbills and satirical poems, which upbraided his partiality, were fixed to the doors of the privy council and of his own house. Of these one was in the following pithy terms:—

Quæritur.

Why John Hepburn, and John Hay of Tallo, are not compelled openly to declare the manner of the king's slaughter, and who consented thereunto?¹

Another was a pasquinade of which the truth was more striking than the poetry. It bore the title of a letter sent by Maddé unto my lord regent,

¹ MS. St. P. Off. Questions to be absolved by the Lords of the Articles. 4th January, 1567-8.

and the whole estates, and strongly insinuated that Hay and Hepburn were about to be hurried out of life and their confessions suppressed, lest they should discover the principal subscribers of the bond for the king's death.¹

By his partial conduct, Murray not only estranged the people, but it was soon apparent that notwithstanding all his efforts, he could not long keep his party together. Even in the parliament, his legislation on the subject of religion had been condemned by Athol, Caithness, and the Bishop of Murray, and the provision for the ministers of the church was an unpopular measure with a majority of the lords. He had endeavoured indeed, to secure the support of the chief nobility and barons by rewards and favours. Lethington had received the sheriffship of Lothian, Hume that of Lauderdale, Morton the promise of the Lord High Admiral's place, vacant by the forfeiture of Bothwell, Kirkaldy of Grange had been made governor of Edinburgh Castle, and Huntly and Argyle were courted by the prospect held out to

¹ MS. St. P. Off. A letter sent by Maddé to My Lord Regent and the haill estates :—

My lordes all, the king is slain,—
 Revenge his cause in hand,
 Or else your doing is all but vain,
 For all your general Band.

If ye shall punish but *simple* men,
 And let the *principal* pass,
 Then God and man shall you misken,
 And make you therefore base.

* * * *

them of a matrimonial alliance with the regent's daughter and sister-in-law.¹ But even these prizes and promises sometimes failed in their effect, every one being ready to magnify his own merit, and to anticipate a higher distinction than was bestowed. Nor did it escape observation, that his conduct since his elevation had become haughty and distant to those proud nobles who had so recently been his equals, whilst he was open to flattery, and suffered inferior men to gain his confidence. Even the vigour with which he punished the riot and lawlessness of the border district failed to increase his popularity, the kingdom having been so long accustomed to a more relaxed rule, that justice was construed into tyranny.

Owing to such causes, it was apparent that Murray's government, soon after the dissolution of Parliament, was in a precarious state. The Hamiltons hated him ; to Lethington intrigue and change seemed to be the only elements in which he could live. Herries and the Melvils were strongly suspected. Balfour, who knew many secrets, and was capable of any treachery, had left court in disgust. Athol was beginning to be lukewarm ;²

¹ MS. Letter, St. P. Off. B. C. Berwick. Drury to Cecil, Jan. 4, 1567-8. Huntly's son was to marry his daughter, Argile's brother, his sister-in-law.

² MS. Letter, St. P. Off. B. C. Drury to Cecil, Berwick, Jan. 4, 1567-8. Also MS. Letter, St. P. Off. B. C. Drury to Cecil, Berwick, Jan. 21, 1567-8. Ibid. Same to same, Berwick, Feb. 2, 1567-8. Also Ibid. Same to same, Berwick April 2, 1568.

the friends of the Romish religion resented his late conduct, and the people, never long in one mind, began to pity the protracted and rigorous imprisonment of the queen.¹ All these circumstances were against him; but they were trivial to the blow which now fell upon him, for it was at this very crisis, that Mary effected her escape in a manner that almost partakes of romance.

Since her interview with Murray, the captive queen had exerted all the powers of fascination which she so remarkably possessed, to gain upon her keepers. The severe temper of the regent's mother, the lady of the castle, had yielded to their influence,² and her son George Douglas, the younger brother of Lochleven, smitten by her beauty, and flattered by her caresses, enthusiastically devoted himself to her interest. It was even asserted that he had aspired to her hand, that his mother talked of a divorce from Bothwell, and that Mary, never insensible to admiration and solicitous to secure his services, did not check his hopes.³ However this may be, Douglas for some time had bent his whole mind to the enterprise, and on one occasion, a little before this, had nearly succeeded; but the queen, who had assumed the dress of a laundress, was detected by the extraordinary whiteness of her

¹ MS. Letter, St. P. Off. B.C. Drury to Cecil. 2d April, 1568.

² MS. Letter, St. P. Off. B. C. Drury to Cecil, Berwick, Sept. 30, 1567. Melvil's Memoirs, p. 199.

³ MS. Letter, St. P. Off. B. C. Drury to Cecil, April 2, 1568. Also MS. Letter, St. P. Off. — to Cecil, May 9, 1568.

hands, and carried back in the boat which she had entered to her prison.¹

This discovery had nearly ruined all, for Douglas was dismissed from the castle, and Mary more strictly watched; but nothing could discourage her own enterprize, or the zeal of her servant. He communicated with Lord Seaton and the Hamiltons, he carried on a secret correspondence with the queen; he secured the services of a page who waited on his mother, called Little Douglas, and by his assistance at length effected his purpose. On the evening of the 2nd of May, this youth, in placing a plate before the castellan, contrived to drop his napkin over the key of the gate of the castle, and carried it off unperceived: he hastened to the queen, and hurrying down to the outer gate, they threw themselves into the little boat which lay there for the service of the garrison. At that moment Lord Seaton and some of her friends were intently observing the castle from their concealment on a neighbouring hill; a party waited in the village below, while nearer still, a man lay watching on the brink of the lake.² They could see a female figure with two attendants glide swiftly from the outer gate. It was Mary herself, who breathless with delight and anxiety, sprung into the boat, holding a little girl, one of her maidens, by the hand, while the page, by locking the gate behind

¹ Keith, 470.

² Proofs and Illustrations—No. 5, from the MSS. of Prince Labanoff, and Letter of Kirkaldy to Lochleven Morton, MSS.

them, prevented immediate pursuit. In a moment, her white veil with its broad red fringe (the concerted signal of success) was seen glancing in the sun, the sign was recognised and communicated, the little boat, rowed by the page and the queen herself, touched the shore, and Mary, springing out with the lightness of recovered freedom, was received first by George Douglas, and almost instantly after by Lord Seaton and his friends. Throwing herself on horseback, she rode at full speed to the Ferry, crossed the firth, and galloped to Niddry, having been met on the road by Lord Claud Hamilton with fifty horse. Here she took a few hours rest, wrote a hurried despatch to France, dispatched Hepburn of Riccarton to Dunbar, with the hope that the castle would be delivered to her, and commanded him to proceed afterwards to Denmark, and carry to his master, Bothwell, the news of her deliverance.¹ Then again taking horse, she galloped to Hamilton, where she deemed herself in safety.

The news of her escape flew rapidly through the kingdom, and was received with joy by a large portion of her nobility, who crowded round her with devoted offers of homage and support. The Earls of Argile, Cassillis, Eglinton, and Rothes,

¹ Proofs and Illustrations, No. 5. MS. Letter, St. P. Off. B. C. Drury to Cecil, April 2, 1568. Also MS. Letter, Copy, St. P. Off. — to Cecil, May 9, 1568. MS. Letter, St. P. Off. B. C. Drury to Cecil, May 26, 1568. Also Memoir towards Riccartoun, MS. St. P. Off. Also MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Willok to Cecil, May 31, 1568.

the Lords Somerville, Yester, Livingston, Herries, Fleming, Ross, Borthwick, and many other barons of power and note crowded to Hamilton. Orders were sent by them to put their vassals and followers in instant motion, and Mary soon saw herself at the head of six thousand men.

She now assembled her council, declared to them that her demission of the government, and consent to the coronation of her son, had been extorted by the imminent fear of death, and appealed for the truth of the statement to Robert Melvil, who stood beside her and solemnly confirmed it. An act of council was then passed, declaring all the late proceedings by which Murray had become regent treasonable and of none effect, and a bond drawn up by the nobility for the defence of their sovereign, and her restitution to her crown and kingdom, which in the enthusiasm of the moment, was signed by eight earls, nine bishops, eighteen lords, twelve abbots and priors, and nearly one hundred barons. But the queen, though encouraged by this burst of loyalty, felt a desire to avoid the misery of a civil contest, and in this spirit sent a message to Murray with offers of reconciliation and forgiveness.¹

The regent was in Glasgow, a city not eight miles from Mary's camp at Hamilton, engaged in public

¹ Keith, p. 475. Also MS. Letter, St. P. Off. 8 May, 1568. Endorsed in Cecil's hand, "Band of 9 Earls, 9 Bishops, 18 Lords, and others for defence of the Queen of Scots," Melvil's Memoirs, p. 200. Also Drury to Cecil, May 7, 1568. Keith, p. 474,

business and attended only by the officers of the law and his personal suite, when almost at the same instant he received news of the queen's escape and her overtures for a negotiation. It was a trying crisis—one of those moments in the life of a public man which test his judgment and his courage. Already the intelligence, though but a few hours old, had produced an unfavourable effect upon his party. Some openly deserted, and sought the queen's camp, others silently stole away, many wavered, and not a few, whilst they preserved the show of fidelity, secretly made preparations for joining the enemy.

Under these difficult circumstances Murray exhibited that rapid decision and clearness of judgment which mark a great man. When counselled to retire, he instantly rejected the advice. "Retreat," said he, "must not for a moment be contemplated. It is certain ruin—it will be construed into flight, and every hour's delay will strengthen the queen and discourage our adherents. Our only chance is in an instantaneous attack before Huntly, Ogilvy, and the northern men have joined the royal force." Pretending, however, to deliberate upon the offers of negotiation, he gained a brief respite : this he used to publish a proclamation, in which he declared his determination to support the king's government, and sending information to the Merse, Lothian, and Stirlingshire, was rapidly joined by a considerable body of his friends. Morton, Glencairn, Lennox, and Semple lost no

time, but marshalled their strength and advanced by forced marches to Glasgow.¹ Mar dispatched reinforcements and cannon from Stirling; Grange, whose veteran experience in military affairs was of infinite value at such a moment, took the command of the horse, and Murray had the good sense to entrust to him the general arrangements for the approaching battle. Hume, also a skilful soldier, not only foiled Hepburn of Riccarton in his attempt to seize Dunbar for the queen,² but kept the Merse-men from declaring for her, and soon joined the regent with six hundred men, whilst Edinburgh beat up for recruits and sent a small force of hackbutters. The effects which so invariably follow decision and confidence were soon apparent, and in ten days Murray commanded an army of four thousand men.³

Amid these preparations Mary sent her servant, John Beaton to England and the French court, soliciting support. In return, the English Queen resolved to dispatch Dr. Leighton into Scotland with her warm congratulations, and an assurance that if her sister would submit the decision of her affairs to his royal mistress and abstain from

¹ Drury to Cecil, May 7, 1568. Keith, p. 474. MS. Letter, St. P. Off. B. C. Drury to Cecil. Berwick, May 10, 1568. Proclamation of the King of Scots, May 7, 1568, broadside, St. P. Off. Printed by Lekprevick. Also Ibid. MS. Proclamation of the Regent for the gathering of the country, May 3, 1568.

² Drury to Cecil, May 6, 1568. Keith, p. 474.

³ MS. St. P. Off. Advertisements of the Conflict in Scotland, May 16, 1568.

calling in any foreign aid, she would speedily either persuade or compel her subjects to acknowledge her authority.¹ It happened, too, that shortly previous to her escape, Monsieur de Beaumont, an ambassador from Henry, had arrived from France to solicit, as he affirmed, an interview with the captive princess, which had been positively refused. Some suspected that he came to urge the expediency of a divorce from Bothwell, and a marriage between Mary and the lord of Arbroath, second son of the Duke of Chastelherault. Others affirmed, that like De Lignerolles, his secret instructions were more favourable to the regent than the queen; but, however this may be, he now resorted to the camp at Hamilton, and apparently exerted himself to procure a reconciliation between the two factions.²

We have already seen, that this was agreeable to Mary's own wishes. Her inclination from the first had been to avoid a battle, to retire to Dumbarton, a fortress which had been all along kept for her by Lord Fleming, and to regain by degrees her influence over her nobility and her people. In this wise and humane policy she was opposed by the ambition and fierce impatience of the Hamiltons, who, seeing themselves the strongest party, deemed the moment favourable to crush Murray for ever, and

¹ MS. St. P. Off. wholly in Cecil's hand, "Instructions for Mr. Thomas Leighton sent into Scotland."

² MS. Letter, St. P. Off. B. C. Forster to Cecil, Alnwick, April 30, 1568. Also MS. St. P. Off. Advertisements of the Conflict in Scotland, Keith, p. 478.

to obtain an ascendancy over the queen and the government.¹

So far, however, Mary's influence prevailed, that they consented to march from Hamilton to Dumbarton, and Murray congratulating himself upon their resolution, immediately drew out his little army on the moor beside Glasgow, resolved to watch their movements, and if possible bring them to an engagement. For this purpose Grange had previously examined the ground, and the moment he became aware that the queen's army kept the south side of the river, the regent's camp being on the opposite bank, he mounted a hackbutter behind each of his horsemen, rapidly forded the Clyde and placed them advantageously amongst some cottages, hedges, and little yards or gardens which skirted each side of a narrow lane through which the queen's troops must defile.²

Whilst this manœuvre was successfully performing, Murray, who led the main battle, and Morton, who commanded the vanguard or advance, crossed the river by a neighbouring bridge and drew up their men, a movement which was scarcely completed when the queen's vanguard, two thousand strong, and commanded by Lord Claud Hamilton, attempting to carry the lane, was received by a close and deadly fire from the hackbutter in the hedges and cottage gardens. This killed many, drove them back, and threw

¹ *Memoirs of James the Sext*, p. 25. *Melvil's Memoirs*, p. 200.

² *Melvil's Memoirs*, pp. 200, 201.

their ranks into confusion; but, confident in their numbers, they pressed forward up the steep of the hill, so that the men were already exhausted when they suddenly found themselves encountered by Murray's advance, which was well breathed, and in firm order. It was composed of the flower of the border pikemen. Morton, who led it, with Hume, Ker of Cessford, and the barons of the Merse, all fought on foot, and when the first charge took place, Grange's clear voice was heard above the din of battle, calling to them to keep their pikes shouldered till the enemy had levelled theirs, and then to push on.¹ They obeyed him, and a severe conflict took place. It was here only that there was hard fighting, and Sir James Melvil, who was present, describes the long pikes as so closely crossed and interlaced, that when the soldiers behind discharged their pistols and threw them or the staves of their shattered weapons in the faces of their enemies, they never reached the ground but remained lying on the spears.²

For some time the conflict was doubtful, till Grange perceiving the right wing of the regent's advance (consisting of the Renfrewshire barons) beginning to give way, galloped to the main battle and brought Lindsay, Lochleven, Sir James Balfour, and their followers, to reinforce the weak point. This they did effectually, and their attack was so

¹ Melvil's Memoirs, p. 201. MS. St. P. Off. Advertisements of the Conflict in Scotland, May 16, 1568.

² Melvil's Memoirs, p. 201.

furious that it broke the queen's ranks and threw all into confusion. Murray, who had hitherto stood on the defensive, contenting himself with repulsing the enemy's cavalry, which was far superior in numbers and equipment to his own, now seized the moment to charge with the main battle, and the flight became universal.¹ At this instant, too, the chief of the Macfarlanes and two hundred of his highlanders broke in upon the scattered fragments of the army with the leaps and yells peculiar to their mode of fighting,² and the pursuit would have been sanguinary but for the generous exertions of the regent, who called out to save the fugitives and employed his cavalry, with Grange who commanded them, not as instruments of slaughter but of mercy. This decisive battle lasted only three quarters of an hour. On the queen's side there were but three hundred slain—some accounts say only half that number.³ On the regent's only a single soldier fell. Ten pieces of brass cannon were taken and many prisoners of note. Amongst the rest, the Lords Seaton and Ross, the masters, or eldest sons of the Earls of Eglinton and Cassillis, the sheriffs of Ayr, the sheriff of Linlithgow, a Hamilton who bore their standard in the vanguard, the lairds of Pres-

¹ Ibid. Also History of James the Sext, p. 26. Also Calderwood's Account in Keith, p. 480.

² MS. St. P. Off. May 16, 1568. Advertisements of the Conflict in Scotland.

³ M.S. Orig. St. P. Off. Advertisement of the Conflict in Scotland, May 16, 1568. Also Melvil's Memoirs, p. 202.

ton, Innerwick, Pitmilly, Balvearie, Boyne, and Trabrown, Robert Melvil and Andrew Melvil, two sons of the Bishop of St. Andrew's, and a son of the Abbot of Kilwinning. It was reported that Argile was made prisoner, but purposely suffered to escape. On the regent's side Hume, Ochiltree, and Andrew Car of Faudonside, were severely wounded.¹ Previous to the conflict Mary had taken her station upon an eminence half-a-mile distant, which commanded a view of the field. She was surrounded by a small suite, and watched the vicissitudes of the fight with breathless eagerness and hope. At last when the charge of Murray took place, witnessing the total dispersion of her army, she fled in great terror and at full speed in the direction of Dumfries, nor did she venture to draw bridle till she found herself in the abbey of Dundrennan, sixty miles from the field.²

On arriving at this place, which was on the confines of England, the queen declared her intention of retreating into that country and throwing herself upon the protection of Elizabeth. It was a hasty and fatal resolution, adopted against the advice of those faithful servants who had followed her in her flight, and must have been dictated more by the terror of her own subjects than by any well grounded confidence in the character of Elizabeth. Lord Herries, who accompanied her, had taken

¹ MS. St. P. Off. Advertisements of the Conflict in Scotland, 16 May, 1568.

² Ibid.

the precaution of writing to Lowther, the deputy-governor of Carlisle, desiring to know whether his royal mistress might come safely to that city, but such was her impatience, that before any answer could be returned she had taken a boat and passed over in her riding dress and soiled with travel, to Workington, in Cumberland. Here she was recognized by the gentlemen of the country, who conveyed her to Cockermouth, from which Lowther conducted her with all respect and honour to Carlisle.¹ Amongst her attendants were the Lords Herries, Fleming, and Livingston.

While still at Workington, the queen of Scots had written to Elizabeth describing the wrongs she had endured from her rebellious subjects, alluding to the recent defeat at Langsyde, and expressing her confident hope that the queen would protect and assist her against her enemies. She concluded with these pathetic words, "It is my earnest request that your majesty will send for me as soon as possible, for my condition is pitiable, not to say for a queen, but even for a simple gentlewoman. I have no other dress than that in which I escaped from the field; my first day's ride was sixty miles across the country, and I have not since dared to travel except by night."²

¹ MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Papers of Mary Queen of Scots. Lowther to Cecil, 1568, 18th May; also MS. St. P. Off. Advertisements out of Scotland, 18 May, 1568.

² Anderson, vol. iv. p. 33. The original letter is in French, Calig. C. I. fol. 68.

On receiving this letter, Elizabeth felt that Mary was at last in her power, and she did not hesitate to avail herself of the fatal error which had been committed. Her first orders to the sheriffs on the 19th of May, sufficiently show this. She commanded them to treat the Scottish Queen and her suite with honour and respect, but to keep a strict watch, and prevent all escape.¹ At the same time Lady Scrope, sister to the Duke of Norfolk, was sent to wait upon her, and Sir Francis Knollys, arrived with letters of condolence;² but impatient under these formalities, and anxious for a personal interview, Mary addressed a second letter to Elizabeth, in which she entreated, that as her affairs were urgent, she might be permitted instantly to see the queen, to vindicate herself from the false aspersions which had been cast upon her by her ungrateful subjects, and to dispel the doubts which she understood were entertained. She had sent up Lord Herries, she said, to communicate with her sister, and Lord Fleming to carry a message to France, but she entreated if any resolution had been formed against assisting her (a decision which must surely come from others, not from Elizabeth's own heart), leave might be given her as freely to depart from her dominions, as she had freely entered them. Nothing could so much injure her

¹ Copy, St. P. Off. By the Queen, to the Sheriffs, Justices of Peace, &c., of Cumberland.

² Anderson, vol. iv., P. i., pp. 52, 53. Lord Scrope and Knollys to the Queen, Carlisle, 29 May, 1568.

cause as delay, and already had she been detained in the state of a prisoner for fifteen days, a proceeding, which, to speak frankly, she found somewhat hard and strange. In conclusion, she reminded Elizabeth of some circumstances connected with the ring, which she now sent her. It bore the emblem of a heart, and had probably been a gift of the English Queen. "Remember," said she, "I have kept my promise. I have sent you my heart in the ring, and now I have brought to you both heart and body, to knit more firmly the tie that binds us together."¹

The offer in this letter to vindicate herself in person before Elizabeth, was earnestly pressed by Mary in her first interview with Scrope and Knollys. Her engaging manner, and the spirit and eloquence with which she defended herself, made a deep impression on both. She openly declared, that Morton and Lethington were cognizant of the king her husband's murder, and Knollys confessed, that although he began by accusing her of that dreadful crime, the sight of her tears soon transformed him into a comforter.²

Meanwhile Murray lost no time in following up the advantage which he had gained, and after the retreat of the queen, having made an expedition northward, at the head of a large force, and for the moment put down opposition, he returned to

¹ Ibid. pp. 48, 49, 50. History of James the Sixth, pp. 27, 28.

² Id. Anderson, vol. iv. pp. 58, 59. Knollys to Elizabeth, Carlisle, 30 May, 1568.

the capital, to let loose the vengeance of the laws against those who had resisted his government. Notwithstanding the accusations of his enemies, no instance of cruelty or revenge can be proved against him: whether it was that his nature was really an enemy to blood, or that he found fines and forfeitures a more effectual way of destroying his opponents and enriching his friends.¹ These occupations at home, however, did not prevent his cares for his safety on the side of England. As soon as he heard of Mary's retreat to Carlisle, and her offer to vindicate herself before Elizabeth, he sent up his secretary or confidential servant Wood, to express his readiness instantly to appear in person with the Earl of Morton, to answer any charges brought against him, to produce evidence to justify his conduct and that of his companions, and as Drury expresses it, to enter himself prisoner in the Tower of London, if he did not prove her guilty in the death of the king her husband.²

This proposal of both parties to vindicate themselves before the Queen of England, and to make her the arbiter of their mutual wrongs, came very opportunely to Elizabeth, as she was at that moment engaged with her council in a deliberation on the proper course to be pursued, in consequence of the flight of the Scottish Queen. Knollys had

¹ MS. Letter, St. P. Off. B. C. Drury to Cecil, May 26, 1568.

² MS. Letter, St. P. Off. B. C. Drury to Cecil, May 22, 1568. Also MS. Letter, St. P. Off. B. C. Drury to Cecil, June 17, 1568.

already warned her of the impression made upon the Roman Catholics in the North by her arrival, and had urged the necessity either of granting her assistance, or, if that was held too much, restoring her to liberty. . Rumours and speeches, so he wrote, were already blown about the country, exposing in strong language, the ungratefulness of her detention, and indeed so manifest a wrong was committed by her imprisonment, it involved so flagrant a breach of the common principles of law and justice, that Knollys, an honourable nobleman, felt impatient that he should be made a "Jailor," so he expressed it, in such a cause.¹

Of all this, Elizabeth and her ministers were well aware ; but in that unscrupulous and accommodating school of politics for which the times were conspicuous, when principle and expediency were found at variance, there was seldom much hesitation which should give way, and it was resolved that, in this instance, honour and justice should be sacrificed to necessity. And here, although I must strongly condemn the conduct of the English Queen, it is impossible not to see the difficulties by which she was surrounded. The party which it was her interest to support, was that of Murray and the Protestants. She looked with dread on France, and the resumption of French influence in Scotland. Within her own realm, the Roman Catholics were unquiet and dis-

¹ Knollys to Cecil, Carlisle, 2 June, 1568. Anderson, iv. Part i, p. 61.

contented, and in Ireland constantly on the eve of rebellion—if such a word can be used to the resistance of a system too grinding to be tamely borne. All these impatient spirits looked to Mary as a point of union and strength. Had she been broken by her late reverses, had she manifested a sense of the imprudence by which she had been lately guided, or evinced any desire to reform her conduct, or forgive her subjects who had risen against the murderer of her husband more than against herself, the queen might have been inclined to a more favourable course. But the very contrary was the case. Her first step after her escape had been to resume her correspondence with Bothwell.¹ His creatures Hepburn of Riccarton, and the two Ormiston, blotted as accomplices in his crime, had frequent access to her. In her conversations with Knollys and Scrope, she could not repress her anticipations of victory and purposes of vengeance, if once again a free princess. She declared, that rather than have peace with Murray, she would submit to any extremity, and call help from Turkey before she gave up the contest, and she lamented bitterly that the delays of Elizabeth emboldened the traitors who had risen against her.² Was the queen of England at such a crisis, and

¹ MS. Letter, St. P. Off. B.C. Drury to Cecil, Berwick 26 May, 1568; also MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Mr. John Willok to Cecil, Edinburgh, 31 May, 1568.

² Anderson, vol. iv., Part i., p. 71. Knollys to Cecil, 11 June, 1568; also Ibid. p. 74. Bishop of Durham to Cecil, 27 June, 1568. MS. St. P. Off. B. C.

having such a rival in her power, to dismiss her at her first request, and permit her to overwhelm her friends and allies, to re-establish the Roman Catholic party, and possibly the Roman Catholic religion in Scotland? After such conduct, could it be deemed either unlooked for, or extraordinary, should she fall from the proud position she now held, as the head of the Protestant party in Europe? So argued the far-sighted Cecil, and the queen his mistress followed, or it is probable in this instance anticipated, his counsel. It was determined to detain Mary a prisoner, to refuse her a personal meeting, to support Murray in the regency, and to induce him to make public the proofs which he possessed of the guilt of his sovereign the Queen of Scots.

With this view, Elizabeth wrote to the regent, and soon after dispatched Mr. Middlemore with a message both to him and to the Scottish Queen. She informed him in her letter, that he was accused by his sovereign of the highest crimes which a subject could commit against his prince, rebellion, imprisonment of her person, and her expulsion from her dominions by open battle. She admonished him to forbear from all hostility, and as her royal sister, who would observe the same abstinence, was content to commit to her the hearing and ordering of her cause, she required him to bring forward his defences against the crimes of which he was accused.¹

¹ Elizabeth to Murray, June 8, 1568. Anderson, vol. iv. Part i., pp. 68, 69.

Before repairing to Murray in Scotland, Middlemore was admitted to an interview with Mary, at Carlisle. He informed her, that his mistress disclaimed all idea of keeping her a prisoner, her present detention at Carlisle having no other object than to save her from her enemies. As to a personal interview that was at present impossible. She was accused of being an accomplice in a foul and horrible crime, the murder of her husband. She had made choice of the queen of England to be the only judge of her cause, and care must be taken not to prejudice her defence, and give a handle to her enemies by admitting her to her presence, before trial had been made of her innocence.

At these words *judge* and *trial*, which escaped Middlemore, Mary's spirit rose, and she at once detected and exposed the artful diplomacy of which she was about to be made the victim. It was God, she exclaimed, who could alone be her judge, as a queen she was amenable to no human tribunal. Of her own free will, indeed, she had offered to make Elizabeth the confidant of her wrongs, to defend herself against the falsehoods brought against her, and to utter to her such matters as had never yet been disclosed to any living being, but none could compel her to accuse herself, and as to Murray, and those rebels who had joined him, her sister was partial. She was contented, it appeared, that they should come to her presence to arraign her, whilst she, their sovereign, was debarred from

that indulgence in making her defence. Who ever heard that subjects and traitors should be permitted to plead against their prince? And yet, said she, if they must needs come, bid the queen, my sister, call up Morton and Lethington, who are said to know most against me—confront me with them—let me hear their accusations, and then listen to my reply.—But, she added significantly,—I suspect that Lethington would be loath of such an errand.¹

It had been Mary's idea from some expressions used by Scrope and Knollys in their first interview,² that the English Queen would be induced to restore her without enquiry, or at least by an enquiry so regulated as to criminate her subjects without permitting them to reply; but the mission of Middlemore dispelled this notion. She found that not only was she to be refused an interview with the English Queen, but that Murray had been already called upon to repair to England, and to justify his conduct by bringing forward his proofs against his sovereign. Against this she loudly protested, and at once declared, that she would endure imprisonment, and even death, sooner than submit to such indignity.³ Such conduct was, no doubt, completely consonant to her feelings and her rights as

¹ Anderson, vol. iv., Part i., p. 90. Middlemore to Cecil, 14 June, 1568.

² Ibid. Id. p. 55. Scrope and Knollys to Elizabeth, 29 May, 1568.

³ Mary to Elizabeth, 13 June, 1568. Anderson, vol. iv. p. 97, Part i.

a free princess, and may have been quite consistent with her complete guiltlessness of the charges brought against her, but it seems to me, that complete innocence would have been impatient to have embraced even the opportunity of an imperfect defence, rather than endure the atrocious aspersions with which she was now loaded.

Murray in the mean time acted with his accustomed calmness and decision. Having received Middlemore's message at Dumfries, hostilities against Mary's partisans were suspended at the request of the English Queen, and he professed his readiness to repair to England in person, accompanied by Morton, rather than that the truth should not be fully investigated;¹ but previous to this, there was one point upon which he desired to be satisfied. It was evident, he said, that in a cause involving such grave results, nothing could be more ruinous for him than to accuse the queen, the mother of his sovereign, and afterwards, as he expressed it, "to enter into qualification with her."² Again, if the accusation should proceed, and he was able to prove his allegations, he was solicitous to know what was likely to follow. As to such letters of the queen of Scots as were in his possession, he had already sent translations of them by his servant, Wood, and he would gladly understand whether in the event of the originals agreeing with these translations, their

¹ MS. Letter, St. P. Off. B.C. Drury to Cecil, 17 June, 1568.

² MS. St. P. Off. Murray to Cecil, with enclosure, 22 June, 1568.

contents would be judged sufficient to establish her accession to the murder.¹

This preliminary enquiry, so artful in its object, for it is evident it enabled the regent to arrange or amend his proofs according to the instructions which he might receive from England, was entrusted to Middlemore, who on his return to the English court, reported it to Elizabeth, and at the same time informed her of Mary's resolution to decline the intended investigation. Cecil's answer was framed with the evident view of being communicated by Lord Herries, who was then at the English court, to his sovereign. It informed the regent that Elizabeth neither meant to promote any accusation of the Scottish Queen, nor to proceed to any condemnation, that her single purpose was to settle all disputes, to allow of no faults in her sister, to bring the controversy to a happy conclusion with surety to all parties, and to esteem no proofs sufficient till both parties were heard.²

Such a declaration must have startled Murray, and had he believed it, it is evident from the cautious tone of his previous enquiries that no accusation of the queen of Scots was to be looked for from him. But Elizabeth at this moment exerted all the powers of that state craft in which she was so great an adept, to blind

¹ Goodall, vol. ii. p. 75. Murray's answer to Middlemore, 22 June, 1568.

² Goodall, vol. ii. p. 89. Answer by Cecil to the Earl of Murray's proposals, 31 June, 1568.

both Murray and Mary. It was her object to persuade the regent, that whatever might be her assurances to Mary, she really intended to try the cause, and if he could prove her guilty, to keep her, where she was, in prison; it was her purpose on the other hand, to convince Mary that she would never permit Murray to bring forward any accusation, but quashing all odious criminations, promote a reconciliation with her subjects, and restore her to her dignity. The negotiations were conducted on the part of the Scottish Queen by Lord Herries, who was then at the English court, and by Cecil's directions, such only of this nobleman's proposals as it was deemed expedient Murray should know were communicated to the regent,¹ whilst from Mary we may believe the same concealment was made of Murray's entire messages.

These artful transactions occupied nearly a month, and were interrupted, not only by the suspicions and delays of both parties, but by the state of Scotland. In that country Murray's unpopularity was now excessive, whilst the queen's friends were daily rising into confidence and strength. The severity of the regent, and the terrors of an approaching parliament, in which the dismal scenes of forfeiture and confiscation were expected to be renewed, had so estranged his supporters and united his enemies, that he began to be alarmed not only for his government, but for his

¹ MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Murray to Cecil, June 22, 1568, with enclosure.

life. A conspiracy for his assassination was discovered, at the head of which were the comptroller Murray of Tullibardin and his brother, the same persons who had acted so bold a part in arraigning Bothwell.¹ The regent was taunted, and not unjustly, with his former activity in prosecuting the king's murder, and his present lukewarmness; and people pointed ironically to his associate, Sir James Balfour, a man universally detested, by his own confession one of the murderers, and now employed by Murray in the most confidential affairs of the government.²

To such a height had these discontents arisen, that Argyle, Huntly, and the Hamiltons, uniting their strength in favour of the queen, held a convention at Largs (July 28) in which they resolved to let loose the borderers upon England, and wrote to the Duke of Alva requesting his assistance in the most earnest terms.³ Notwithstanding the delays produced by this miserable state of things, Mary and the regent at last agreed to have their disputes settled by the English Queen, and Lord Herries having arrived at Bolton Castle, to which place the Scottish Queen had been removed, informed his mistress, in the presence of Scrope

¹ MS. Letter, St. P. Off. B. C. July 20, 1568, Drury to Cecil. Also Id. Ibid. Same to same, July 31, 1568. Also Id. Ibid. Same to same, 3d Aug. 1568.

² MS. Letter, St. P. Off. B. C. Drury to Cecil, July 10, 1568.

³ MS. Letter, St. P. Off. B. C. Drury to Cecil, 3d Aug. 1568. MS. St. P. Off. Lords of Scotland to Duke of Alva.

and Knollys, of Elizabeth's proposals, and received her formal acquiescence. As some controversy has arisen upon this point, it is right to give his very words. He told Mary, that Elizabeth had commanded him to say unto her, "that if she would commit her cause to be heard by her highness order, but not to make her highness judge over her, but rather as to her dear cousin and friend to commit herself to her advice and counsel, that if she would thus do, her highness would surely set her again in her seat of regiment, and dignity regal, in this form and order. First, her highness would send for the noblemen of Scotland, that be her adversaries, to ask account of them, before such noblemen as this queen herself should like of, to know their answer, why they have deposed their queen and sovereign from her regiment, and that if in their answers they could allege some reason for them in their so doing, (which her highness thinks they cannot do) that her highness would set this queen in her seat regal *conditionally*, that those her lords and subjects should continue in their honours, estates, and dignities to them appertaining. But if they should not be able to allege any reason of their doings, that then her highness would *absolutely* set her in her seat regal, and that by force of hostility, if they should resist." To this promise, which is quite clear and explicit, Elizabeth annexed as conditions, that Mary should renounce all claim to the crown of England, during the life of the queen, or her issue, that she

should forsake the league with France, and abandoning the mass, receive the Common Prayer after the form of England.¹ This last stipulation was added with a view of encouraging some symptoms of a disposition to be converted to the Church of England, which had recently appeared in Mary—who had received an English chaplain, and “had grown to a good liking of the Common Prayer.”²

These proposals the queen of Scots embraced after some hesitation, and commissioners would have been immediately appointed for the trial of this great cause, but for the melancholy state of Scotland. In this country Huntly and Argyle kept the field at the head of a large force, and having completely reduced under the queen’s power the northern and western parts of the kingdom, were rapidly advancing to the south. Their object was, to crush Murray before he could hold the parliament in which they expected the vengeance of the laws to be let loose against themselves, but their march was arrested by letters from their sovereign, who commanded her friends to desist from hostilities, informing them, that Elizabeth would compel the regent to the same course.³ This order, on Mary’s side, was obeyed; on Murray’s, if indeed ever sent by the English Queen, it was openly violated; for scarce were his rivals dispersed, than the parliament met, (18 August) and had it not been for

¹ Anderson, vol. iv. P. i. pp. 109, 110.

² Knollys to Cecil, 28 July. Anderson, vol. iv. P. i. p. 113.

³ Id. vol. iv. P. i. pp. 125, 126.

the remonstrances of Lethington, not a baron who had espoused the cause of the queen would have been left unproscribed. As it was, all his efforts could not save the Archbishop of St. Andrew's, Lord Claud Hamilton, the Bishop of Ross, and many others, who were declared traitors, and forfeited.¹ It was in vain that the lords of Mary's party complained of this cruel and unjust conduct, and prepared for revenge. Murray forgetful of his promises, anticipated their attack, hastily levied a force, overran Annandale and Galloway, and would have reduced all opposition by fire and sword, had not his progress been interrupted by a peremptory message from Elizabeth, who commanded him instantly to lay down his arms, and send commissioners to York to answer for his conduct to his sovereign. If this was delayed or resisted, she declared her resolution instantly to set Mary at liberty, and assist her against her enemies, adding, that his refusal would convince her of his mistress's innocence and his own guilt.²

This mandate Murray did not dare to disobey, whatever may have been his wishes and regrets. He distrusted Elizabeth, he dreaded increasing his unpopularity with the nobles, by openly bringing forward so odious an accusation against his sovereign; he saw that success was doubtful, failure absolute ruin, and when he proposed to select commissioners, all shrunk from so invidious an

¹ Anderson, vol. iv. P. i. pp. 125 126.

² Camden, apud Kennet, p. 412.

office. But he had advanced too far to retract, and digesting, as he best could, the mortification of being arrested in the course of his victories, he determined to appear personally at York, and appointed four commissioners to accompany him. These were the Earl of Morton, the Bishop of Orkney, Lord Lindsay, and the Commendator of Dumfermling. To them he added some assistants, the most noted of whom were Lethington, the secretary, whom he had begun to suspect of a leaning to the queen's cause, and dreaded to leave behind him, the celebrated Buchanan and Mr. James Makgill. Elizabeth now directed the Duke of Norfolk, the Earl of Sussex, and Sir Ralph Sandler, to appear upon her part, and nothing remained but for Mary to appoint her commissioners.¹

Previous to this, she desired to have a consultation with Lesly the Bishop of Ross, and, on his repair to Bolton, this able and attached servant expressed his sorrow that she had agreed to any conference wherein her subjects should be accused, as Murray and his friends, he said, would undoubtedly utter all they could for their defence, although it were to her dishonour, and that of the whole realm; it was vain, he added, to expect that they would openly acknowledge themselves to be ill subjects, and she a good princess, and it would, in his opinion, be far better to endeavour

¹ Goodall, vol. ii. p. 109.

to bring about an amicable arrangement without any accusation on either side. To this, Mary's answer, as reported by Lesly himself, was remarkable. She declared that there was no such danger to be apprehended as he supposed, since the judges would be favourable to her, and she was already assured of the good will of the Duke of Norfolk, who had sent her a message to Bolton, expressive of his attachment to her interests.¹

At this moment Robert Melvil arrived at Bolton with important dispatches from Lethington to Mary. He stated that Murray was determined to utter every thing he could against her, and had carried with him to York the "letters which he had to produce in proof of the murder; he sent her, by the same messenger, copies of these letters which he had clandestinely procured; he assured her, that nothing but a desire to do her service had induced him to come into England, and begged her to send word by Melvil to York, what she thought it best for him to do. Mary, after having carefully examined these letters, which were only the translations from the original French into the Scottish language, sent her answer to Lethington. It is worthy of note, that it contained no assertion as to the forgery or interpolation of these letters, now, as it appears, communicated to her for the first time. It simply requested him to use his efforts to stay the rigorous accusations of Murray,

¹ Examination of the Bishop of Ross at the Tower. Murdin, p. 52.

to labour with the Duke of Norfolk in her favour, and to give full credit to the Bishop of Ross.¹

Having concluded her consultation with Lesly and Melvil, she chose her commissioners. They were the Bishop of Ross, Lords Herries, Boyd, and Livingston, the Abbot of Kilwinning, Sir John Gordon of Lochinvar, and Sir James Cockburn of Skirling.² These persons having received their instructions, proceeded to York, where they met the regent, the Duke of Norfolk, and the rest of the judges.

So far Elizabeth had been successful, and the position in which she had placed herself was certainly most solemn and imposing. Before her pleaded the Queen of Scots, so late her rival and her opponent, now her prisoner awaiting her award, and acknowledging, that if restored to her dignity, she would owe all to her interference. On the other hand, stood the Regent, the representative of the majesty of his sovereign, and the governor of a kingdom, but now receiving the law from her lips whose superior power he did not dare to resist. To hear the cause were assembled the noblest and the wisest in both countries; and besides this, the misfortunes of Mary had created so great and universal a sensation that it is no exaggeration when we say, the eyes not only of England and Scotland, but of Europe, were fixed upon the conferences now opening at York.

¹ Murdin, pp. 52, 53. ² Goodall, vol. ii. p. 109. 31 Sep. 1568.

The commissioners accordingly having assembled, the proceedings began, but, on the very threshold, a sharp dispute arose, when Norfolk observed that the regent, having consented to plead before Elizabeth, must first do homage to the English crown. The proposition was received as an insult, and Murray, red with anger, was hesitating how to answer it, when the cooler Lethington took up the word, and sarcastically remarked, that when the Scottish monarchs received back again the counties of Northumberland and Cumberland, with the manor of Huntingdon, it would be time to talk of homage; but, as to the crown and kingdom of Scotland, both were more free than their own England had recently been when she paid Peter's pence to Rome.¹ The mention of the point, however, rendered some notice of it necessary, and after the oaths had been administered, mutual protestations were taken.² The commissioners of the Scottish Queen then gave in their complaint. It stated, in clear and energetic language, the history of the rebellion against Mary, her deposition and imprisonment, the usurpation of the regency by Murray, her escape, defeat, and flight into England, and her confident hope, that by the mediation of Elizabeth, she might be restored to the peaceable enjoyment of her kingdom.¹

¹ Melvil's *Memoirs*, p. 206. *Lesly's Negotiations*, Anderson iii. p. 15. Also Norfolk to Cecil, Oct. 9th, 1568. Anderson iv. 42.

² Anderson, vol. iv. P. ii. pp. 49, 50.

All now looked with eagerness for Murray's reply, confidently expecting that he would bring forward, as his defence, the accusation of his sovereign, and the promised proofs of her accession to the murder of the king; but, to the surprise and disappointment of Elizabeth, he was seized with a repetition of his former fears, and, instead of proceeding to any accusation requested a preliminary conference with the English commissioners. Being admitted to it, he desired to know whether they would grant him an assurance that their mistress would pronounce the queen of Scots guilty or not guilty, according to the proofs which he laid before them, and in the event of the conviction of the murder, whether the queen of England would sanction his proceedings, maintain the government of the king, and support him in his office of regent.¹ These questions being remitted by the commissioners to Elizabeth, he gave in his defence, which produced new astonishment. It rested solely on Mary's marriage with Bothwell, and detailed the shameful circumstances by which it was accompanied, with the necessity of rising in arms to defend the prince, and of subjecting the queen to a temporary imprisonment, during which she voluntarily resigned the crown. It added not a syllable, directly or indirectly, accusing Mary of being an accomplice in the murder,

¹ Goodall, vol. ii. pp. 123, 126.

² Goodall, vol. ii. p. 130, 131. Oct. 9th, 126, 127.

and did not even contain a hint or an allusion, from which it could be gathered that the regent ever entertained such a suspicion (Oct. 10).¹

It was difficult to account for this sudden and unexpected moderation upon the part of Murray. A few weeks only had elapsed since he had been loud in his accusations, and testified the utmost eagerness to bring forward his proofs. He was now silent on the subject—his defence was general, almost to feebleness, and when, after a few days' interval, it was replied to by Mary's commissioners, who urged, forcibly and triumphantly, the coalition between Bothwell and the lords, his trial and acquittal, and their subsequent recommendation of him as a husband to the queen, he sat down apparently dispirited and confuted, and declined saying another word upon the subject.

A secret intrigue, of which we have already had some slight intimation from Mary's conversation with the Bishop of Ross, furnishes us with a key to all this mystery. It originated in the ambition of the Duke of Norfolk, a nobleman then perhaps the most powerful subject in England, and who had long been a favourer of Mary's title to the crown. There seems, too, to be little doubt that for some time Norfolk had entertained the idea of a marriage with the Scottish Queen, and that he deprecated the present proceedings

¹ Goodall, vol. ii. p. 144 and 139; and *Dépêches de la Motte Fenelon*, published by Mr. P. Cooper, vol. i. pp. 17, 18, a very valuable work.

against her in the strongest manner, although he dared not refuse the task imposed upon him by Elizabeth. These feelings, which he had secretly imparted to the Scottish Queen through his sister Lady Scrope, who waited on her, she had, as we have seen, communicated to Lethington and the Bishop of Ross; and Lethington on his arrival at York procured a secret interview with Norfolk.¹

On this occasion the Duke expressed his astonishment that he and Murray should so far forget their honour as to accuse their sovereign before Elizabeth—as if they thought that England was entitled to be a judge or a superior over the kingdom of Scotland. Lethington warmly deprecated the idea, blamed the weakness of the regent, whose own feelings were against the accusation, declared for his own part that he was there, as Murray well knew, rather as the friend than the enemy of his sovereign, and professed his readiness to exert every effort to quash the accusation.² Norfolk then asked, whether he thought in this matter Murray could be trusted, and the secretary affirming that he might, the Duke took the regent aside and remonstrated with him on the folly and impolicy of his present conduct. “The English Queen, his mistress,” he said, “was resolved during her life to evade the question of the succession; careless what blood might be shed, or what confusion might arise upon the point—as to the true title, none doubted that it lay in the queen

¹ Examination of the Bishop of Ross. Murdin, p. 53.

² Melvil's Memoirs, p. 206.

of Scots and her son, and much he marvelled that the regent, whom he had always reputed a wise and honourable man, should come hither to blacken his mistress, and, as far as he could, destroy the prospect of her and her son's succession.¹ Besides," added he, "you are grievously deceived if you imagine the queen of England will ever pronounce sentence in this cause. We are sent here, no doubt, as commissioners, but we are debarred from coming to a decision, and Elizabeth has fully resolved to arrive at none herself. Do you not see that no answers have been returned to the questions which upon this point were addressed by you to us, and forwarded to the queen? Nay, you can easily put the matter to a more certain proof. Request an assurance under the queen's hand, that when you accuse your sovereign and bring forward your proofs, she will pronounce sentence. If you get it, act as you please—if it is not given, rest assured my information is correct, and all that will come of your accusation will be repentance for your own folly."²

This conversation made a deep impression on Murray, already sufficiently alive to the dangerous part he was playing; and when he imparted it in confidence to Lethington and Sir James Melvil both of

¹ Melvil's *Memoirs*, pp. 206, 207.

² Melvil's *Memoirs*, p. p. 207, 208, 4to. Edit. Melvil's authority here is unquestionable, as he was not only present at York, but the regent made him privy to this secret interview. Also *Dépêches de la Motte Fenelon*, vol. i., p. 17,

them strongly confirmed him in the views stated by Norfolk.¹ From his brother commissioners, Morton and Makgill, and his secretary Wood, who had drawn up the proofs against the Scottish Queen, the regent carefully concealed what had happened, but he determined to follow Norfolk's advice, and bring forward no public accusation till he was assured of the course to be followed by Elizabeth. Such is the secret history of Murray's sudden change, and the present moderation of his conduct towards the queen his sovereign.

But whilst a regard for his own interest prevented him from assuming the character of a public accuser, the regent *privately* exhibited to Norfolk, Sussex, and Sadler the alleged proofs of Mary's guilt, consisting of various bonds or contracts and other papers, besides some letters and love sonnets addressed by her to Bothwell, with a contract of marriage in the handwriting of the Earl of Huntly. These letters had been found, as the Scottish commissioners affirmed, in a little silver casket or coffer; it had been given by the queen to Bothwell, and was afterwards with its contents seized by Morton, and they offered to swear that the letters were written in Mary's own hand. Having carefully inspected them, and drawn up a summary of their contents, Norfolk transmitted it in a letter to Elizabeth, requesting her judgment whether she considered them sufficient to convict the queen of the murder of her husband. He added, at the same time, his own

¹ Melvil's Memoirs, 208.

opinion and that of his brother commissioners, that the proof was conclusive against her, if the letters were really written with her own hand.¹

This, however, was confidential, and unknown to the world, so that if matters had terminated here the result of the enquiry must have been considered highly favourable to Mary. She had triumphantly confuted Murray, and, after his boastful speeches, he had shrunk from any open accusation. But Elizabeth was not to be so easily defeated. She had resolved that Murray should publicly accuse his sovereign of the murder, she was convinced that such an event would be of the greatest service to England whether the Scottish Queen was to be restored to her dignity or detained a prisoner; and with this view she suddenly removed the conferences to Westminster, affirming that York was too distant to allow of a speedy settlement of the controversy, and taking particular care that neither Mary nor her commissioners should suspect any sinister intention upon her part.² How artfully this was managed appears by the original draft of the English Queen's letter, still preserved, and partly in Cecil's handwriting. In it Norfolk and his companions were instructed to be especially careful that the queen of Scots' commissioners should gather no suspicion of the ill success of her cause, but imagine that this new measure was solely intended to accelerate their mistress's re-

¹ The Commissioners to Elizabeth, 11 October, 1568. Anderson, vol. iv. P. ii. pp. 58, 63.

² La Motte Fenelon, vol. iv. p. 18.

storation, to her dignity on safe and honourable terms, both for herself and her subjects.¹

It happened that at this moment Murray had made a secret overture to Mary, which rendered this queen less likely to dread any disadvantage to her cause from the removal of the conferences to London. He had sent Robert Melvil to Bolton, to propose a scheme, by which all necessity for accusing his sovereign should be removed, and an amicable compromise take place. The Scottish Queen was to ratify her demission of the crown, which had been made in Lochleven, the regent was to be confirmed in his government, and Mary was to tarry in England, under the protection of Elizabeth, and with a revenue suitable to her royal dignity. On these conditions Murray was contented to be silent; and although at first the captive princess professed much unwillingness to agree to such terms, she was at length convinced by the arguments of Melvil, that such a settlement of the controversy was the best for her interest and honour. She therefore dispatched Melvil to carry her consent to Murray;² she wrote to the English Queen, expressing her entire satisfaction that her cause and her honour were now placed in her hands, where she most wished them to be,³ and she dis-

¹ Orig. draft. St. P. Off. October 16, 1568, Elizabeth to her commissioners.

² MS. Declaration of Robert Melvil, Hopetoun MS.; also MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Knollys to Cecil, 25 October, 1568.

³ Mary to Elizabeth, 22 Oct., 1568. Anderson, iv. P. ii. p. 95.

patched four of her commissioners, Boyd, Herries, the Bishop of Ross, and the Abbot of Kilwinning, to London.

On their arrival Elizabeth admitted them to an audience, assured them that she had carefully weighed all that had been done at York, that the enemies of the queen of Scots appeared to her to have entirely failed in their defence, as far as they had yet pleaded, and that their only course was to acknowledge their offences, return to their allegiance, and intercede for pardon, which she would labour to procure them. For this purpose she had removed the conferences to London, and to make the settlement more solemn had joined some other commissioners to those already named. Nothing now remained but to proceed with the business, first ascertaining whether Murray had any thing further to say in his defence.¹

When the regent repaired along with Lethington and Makgill to London, it was with a determination not to accuse Mary, but to remain true to his agreement to Norfolk, and if any thing should occur to render its execution difficult or impossible, to fall back upon his scheme for Mary's demission of the crown, which he had so lately proposed, and to which she had consented. But an interview with Elizabeth alarmed and perplexed him; he found, to his dismay, that she was perfectly aware of his intrigues with Norfolk. The whole transactions

¹ Anderson, vol. iv. P. ii, p. 95. Lesly's Negotiations. Anderson, vol. iii. pp. 25, 26.

had been betrayed by a confidant of Mary to Morton; he had indignantly revealed it to Cecil, and from him it reached the queen. Nor were his difficulties lessened by a message from Mary herself, who informed him that the Duke of Norfolk had forbid her to resign the crown; and without his consent she could not abide by her agreement.¹ Nothing could be more embarrassing than his situation. On the one hand Elizabeth did not conceal her anxiety, that he should accuse the Scottish Queen and bring forward his proofs of the murder. She had every thing in her power; she already hinted, that in case of his refusal it might be found necessary to bring forward the Duke of Chastellerault, whose claim to the regency was superior to his own; and it is scarcely matter of wonder that Murray faltered in his resolution. Yet, should he consent to the wishes of the queen of England, he must bear the disgrace of betraying Norfolk. On the other hand, if he remained true to this nobleman, his fellow commissioners were ready to arraign him of treachery to them and to the cause of his sovereign. Under these embarrassments he adopted a middle course, and resolved to prepare the accusation, but not to make it public until he had a positive assurance that the queen of England would pronounce judgment.

Meanwhile Mary became alarmed at some private intelligence which she received from Hepburn

of Riccarton, a follower of Bothwell's, who was now in London, and who assured her that so far from being favourable, Elizabeth was decidedly hostile to her, and would probably succeed in compelling Murray to desert Norfolk and accuse his sovereign.¹ To meet such an emergency she sent additional instructions to her commissioners, by which their powers were limited to the single act of extending her clemency to her disobedient subjects. She added, that if they found any encouragement given to her adversaries to accuse her, they were instantly to demand her personal admission to the presence of Elizabeth, and if this was refused to break up the negotiation.²

The conferences were now opened in the chamber, called the *Camera depicta* at Westminster, the commissioners of the Scottish Queen having declined to meet in any place where a judicial sentence had been pronounced. They protested against any thing which was now done being interpreted against the rights of their mistress, who, as a free princess, acknowledged no judge or superior on earth; and they required, that as Murray had been admitted to the presence of Elizabeth, and had calumniated his sovereign, the English Queen should grant the same privilege to the queen of Scots, and listen to her defence from her own lips. To this Elizabeth replied, that it was far from her intention to assume the character of a judge, or in

¹ MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Knollys to Cecil, 21 November, 1568.

² Goodall, vol. ii. pp. 185, 186, 187.

any thing to touch their sovereign's honour ; but, that to admit her into her presence was impossible till the cause was decided.¹

With this answer they were compelled to be content ; and having retired, Murray and his friends were called in, when being informed that the defences recently made by them at York, were considered inconclusive, they were required to say whether they could urge any thing further in their behalf. To encourage them to speak openly Sir Nicholas Bacon, the lord keeper, assured the regent in reply to the demands made at York, that if the queen of Scots should be proved guilty of the murder of her husband, she should either be delivered into his hands, her life being sufficiently secured, or be kept in England ; and he added, that if found guilty, Murray should be continued in the regency, till it was shown that another had a superior right.²

By this declaration Murray was somewhat reassured. He had prepared his accusation, and the paper which contained it was at that moment in the possession of John Wood, his secretary, who sat beside him at the table, and for greater security kept it in his bosom. The regent now rose and declared how unwilling he and his friends had ever been to touch the honour of their sovereign, or to publish to strangers what might eternally defame her ; how readily, had it been possible, they would

¹ Goodall, vol. ii. p. 188, 189, November 23, 1568.

² Ibid. vol. ii. p. 201, 202, November 26, 1568.

have secured her reputation and preserved their prince, even at the price of their own exile ; and he solemnly protested, that if at last they were compelled to pursue a different course, the blame was not to be imputed to them but rested with their enemies, who constrained them to adopt it in their own defence, and dragged into light the proofs which they had hitherto concealed.¹ Having delivered this protest in writing, Murray prepared to give in his accusation, but before he took this last and fatal step, he required an assurance under the English Queen's hand, that she would pronounce a judgment. To this Cecil replied, that he had ample assurance already ; and it ill became him to suspect or doubt the word of their royal mistress. Where, added he, is your accusation. It is here, said Wood, plucking it from his bosom, and here it must remain till we see the queen's handwrit ; but as he spoke the paper was snatched from him by Bothwell, the Bishop of Orkney, who sprung to the table pursued by Wood, and mid the ill-suppressed laughter of the English commissioners laid it before them. The scene, as it is described by Melvil, must have been an extraordinary one. The regent was deeply mortified, and Cecil, smiling triumphantly, enjoyed his confusion ; Lord William Howard, a rough seaman, shouted aloud, and commended the activity of Bishop Turpy, a nickname of Orkney ; and Leth-

¹ Anderson, vol. iv. Part ii. pp. 115, 118.

ington, who was the saddest of the company, whispered in Murray's ear, that he had ruined his cause for ever.¹

The die, however, was cast, and the charge which had been so long withheld, was now preferred in the broadest terms. The regent stated, that as Bothwell was the chief executor of the horrible murder of their late sovereign, so he and his friends affirmed that the queen his wife had persuaded him to commit it, that she was not only in the foreknowledge of the same, but a maintainer of the assassins, as she had shown by thwarting the course of justice, and by marrying the chief author of that foul crime.² To give additional force and solemnity to this proceeding, the Earl of Lennox, father to the murdered king, at this moment presented himself before the commissioners, and having bewailed in pathetic terms the miserable fate of his son, delivered to them a paper in which he accused Mary in direct terms of conspiring his death.³

When informed of this proceeding, the deputies of this princess expressed the utmost indignation; they declared that nothing could be more false and calumnious than such a statement, that some of those persons, who, now with shameless ingratitude, sought to blacken their sovereign, were themselves deeply implicated in the murder, and they required

¹ Melvil's *Memoirs*, pp. 210, 211.

² Anderson, vol. iv. P. ii. p. 119.

³ Ibid. p. 122.

an immediate audience of Elizabeth.¹ When admitted to her presence, they complained in strong terms of the manner in which she had conducted the proceedings; they reminded her, how carefully it had been provided, that in the absence of their royal mistress, nothing should be done which might affect her honour and royal estate; this they declared had been directly infringed; she had admitted her subjects into her presence; they had been encouraged to load her with the most atrocious imputations; it was now, therefore, their duty, as custodians of their mistress's honour, to demand, that in common justice she should also be heard in person; and to beseech her to arrest the authors of such slanderous practices, till they should answer the charges which should be brought against them.²

This demand perplexed Elizabeth. It was a just and spirited assertion on the part of the Scottish commissioners of their mistress's undoubted right; but the English Queen had not the slightest intention of acquiescing in it. She had now gained her first point, Murray having at last publicly arraigned Mary of the murder; but another and greater object remained: she was desirous of getting possession of the proofs of her guilt, of exhibiting them to her council; and either publishing them to the world, or employing them in intimidating her unhappy prisoner into an acceptance of

¹ Goodall, Appendix, vol. ii. pp. 209-213, inclusive.

² Goodall, Ibid. pp. 213-219. La Motte Fenelon, vol. i. pp. 38-51.

any terms she dictated. Her mode of accomplishing this was artful and politic. It was no doubt quite reasonable, she said, addressing the commissioners of the queen, that their mistress should appear to defend herself against so heinous an imputation as the murder of her husband, a crime of which she never had believed her guilty. As for a personal interview, the only reason why she had refused this was, on account of the common slander against her; and now, since the accusation had been publicly made, it would be inconsistent alike with her honour and that of their mistress, to consent to any compromise or agreement, until the regent and his friends had been called upon to prove their allegations. She therefore had resolved to send for them and demand their proofs, after which she would willingly hear their mistress.¹

The commissioners remonstrated against the manifest partiality and injustice of such a proceeding; they observed, that her majesty must of course act as she pleased; but, for their part, they would never consent that their sovereign's rebellious subjects should be further heard, till she herself were admitted to declare her innocence; and they ended, by solemnly protesting that nothing done hereafter should in any way affect or prejudice her rights.² So far every thing on their part was consistent and agreeable to the indignant feelings of a person unjustly accused; but their next step

¹ Goodall, vol. ii. p. 221, December 4.

² Goodall, vol. ii. p. 223.

is perplexing, and seems not so easily reconcileable with Mary's perfect innocence, for on the same day, they made a final proposal for a compromise, by which Murray, notwithstanding his accusation, might still once more be admitted to the favour of his sovereign, and the disputes between her and her subjects be settled.¹ They added that this scheme seemed to them most consonant to the first intentions of both the queens. It was rejected, however, by Elizabeth—any compromise she said would now affect Mary's honour; better far would it be to summon her accusers, to reprimand and chastise them, for the defamation of their sovereign. She would not call for proofs; but if they persisted in their charge it would be proper to hear what they could allege in their defence.²

Such a proposal for a compromise would certainly tell strongly against the innocence of the Scottish Queen, had it proceeded from herself, after the accusation brought forward by Murray, but this was not the case. It came from her commissioners alone, and, as they afterwards asserted, without any communication with their mistress. When at last, they found it declined, and perceived that Elizabeth had formed a resolution to hear from Murray the alleged proofs of their sovereign's guilt, before she was suffered to open her lips in her defence, they resolved to be equally peremptory: As soon there-

¹ See Anderson, vol. iv. P. ii. pp. 135, 137, for the particulars of this last proposal.

² Id. Ibid. pp. 139, 140.

fore as the regent was summoned before the English commissioners, the Bishop of Ross, and his associates, demanded admission, and coming forward, at once dissolved the conference. They declared that since the queen of England was determined to receive from the regent the proofs of his injurious allegations against their sovereign, before she was heard in her presence, they were compelled to break off all proceedings, and they delivered a written protest, that nothing done hereafter should prejudice the honour or estate of their royal mistress. Cecil and the commissioners declined to receive this paper, affirming, that it misrepresented the answer of the English Queen, but the Scottish deputies withdrew, repeating that they would neither treat nor appear again.¹

From this moment the conferences were truly at an end, but Elizabeth's object was still to be attained—Murray therefore was charged with having defamed his sovereign by an unfounded accusation, and required to defend himself. He did so by the production of those celebrated letters and sonnets which Elizabeth had already secretly examined, and of which he now produced both the originals and the copies. Of these the originals have long since disappeared, and the garbled state of the copies which now exist, and which appear to have been tampered with, certainly, renders their evidence of a suspicious nature. At this time, however, both originals

¹ Anderson, vol. iv. Part ii. pp. 145, 146. Dec. 6, 1568.

and copies were laid before the commissioners, after which the depositions of some servants of the late king, and the confessions of Powrie and others, executed for the murder, were produced.

Having proceeded thus far, and the English commissioners being in possession of the whole proofs against the Scottish Queen, it might have been expected that some opinion would have been pronounced by them. Nothing of the kind, however, took place, neither did Elizabeth herself think it then expedient to say a word upon the subject, but after a short season of delay, she resolved to bring the cause before a more numerous tribunal. With this view the chief of her nobility were summoned to attend a meeting of the Privy Council. There came accordingly the Earls of Northumberland, Westmoreland, Shrewsbury, Worcester, Warwick, and Huntingdon, and from some expressions dropt by Cecil, in a letter to Norris,¹ it may be gathered, that it was intended with their advice to come at last to some important and final decision. Yet this third solemn preparation ended like the rest, in nothing. After the lords had been sworn to secrecy, the whole evidence against the queen of Scots was laid before them, and instead of a judgment upon the authenticity of the proofs, and the alleged guilt of the accused, these noble persons contented themselves with a vague allusion to the "foul matters they had seen," and a general approval of the course

¹ Cabala, p. 155.

adopted by their sovereign. Elizabeth next sent for the Scottish commissioners, and in reply to their demand so recently made for the admission of their royal mistress to defend herself in her presence informed them that, from the turn matters had taken, it had become now more impossible than ever to listen to such a request. It was easy, she said, for Mary either to send some confidential person to court with her defence, or to permit the English Queen to dispatch some noblemen to receive it, or to authorize her deputies to reply to the English commissioners. If she still refused to adopt any one of these methods to vindicate herself, she must not be surprised if so obstinate a silence should be interpreted into an admission of guilt.¹

These specious offers and arguments did not impose upon the Bishop of Ross and his colleagues. They remonstrated loudly against the injustice with which their royal mistress had been treated, they insisted that since she was denied the common privilege of a personal defence, she should be permitted to return as a free princess to her own kingdom, or if she preferred it, to retire to France, and at the same time, as their services were no longer necessary, they requested their dismissal from court.² The queen replied, they might go to Bolton and consult with their mistress, but should not leave England till the conference was at an end. She then addressed to Mary a letter, of which the

¹ Goodall, vol. ii. pp. 257, 260, 263, 264.

² Goodall, vol. ii. p. 267, 268.

object seemed to be, to intimidate her into a defence ; but so perplexed and capricious was Elizabeth's mind at this moment, that on the next day she changed her measures, and in a private communication to Knollys, the vice chamberlain, who then had charge of the Scottish Queen, declared her anxiety to proceed no farther in her cause. It appeared to her, she said, a far better method to endeavour to persuade Mary to resign the government into the hands of Murray, whilst the prince her son, for his safety, should be brought into England. She herself, too, it was added, might continue in that country, and this whole cause of hers, wherewith she had been charged, be committed to perpetual silence.¹

Knollys was directed to manage matters so that this proposal might proceed from herself: but whilst Elizabeth was thus tossed about by so many intricate and contradictory schemes, Mary had transmitted directions to her commissioners which defeated this last artifice. She informed them, that although she still insisted on her right to be heard in person, and adhered to her protestation, it was not her intention to pass over in silence the atrocious calumnies with which she had been assailed ; that Murray and his accomplices in accusing her had been guilty of a traitorous falsehood, and had imputed to her a crime of which they were guilty themselves. She then enjoined them to demand inspection both of the copies and the originals of

¹ Goodall, vol. ii., p. 279, Dec. 22, 1568.

the letters which had been produced against her, and she engaged to give such an answer as should triumphantly establish her innocence.

This spirited appeal, which was made by the Scottish commissioners in peremptory terms,¹ threw Elizabeth into new perplexity, and it required all the skill of Cecil to evade and parry it. Recourse was had to delay, but it produced no change, and on the 7th January, the Bishop of Ross required an audience, in which he repeated the demand in still stronger language. His royal mistress, he said, was ready to answer her calumniators, and once more required in common justice to see the letters, or at least the copies of the letters which had been produced by her enemies, that she might prove them to be themselves the principal authors of the murder, and expose them to all christian princes as liars and traitors.² This fair and moderate request Elizabeth evaded. It appeared to her better, she said, that Mary should resign the crown in favour of her son, that, on the ground of being weary of the government, she should remain privately in England, and make a compromise with her enemies.³ It was instantly answered by Ross, that he had his mistress's command to declare that to such a condition she would never agree—if the letters were produced, and she was permitted to see the evidence against her, she was prepared to defend

¹ Goodall, vol. ii. pp. 288, 289.

² Id. Ibid. p. 297, 299.

³ Goodall, vol. ii. p. 300.

herself. She was ready also to entertain any honourable proposal by which a pardon might be extended to her disobedient subjects, notwithstanding the greatness of their offences, but to resign her crown would be to condemn herself—it would be said, she was afraid of a public accusation, and shrunk from enquiry.—This, therefore, she would sooner die than consent to, and the last words she uttered should be those of a queen of Scotland.¹

Elizabeth struggled violently against this determination, and was unwilling to receive it. She intreated Ross again to write to his mistress, but this he steadily refused. She required him and his colleagues to confer with her council. They did so, but it was only to re-iterate Mary's final resolution.²

It was now become absolutely necessary that the Queen of England should either grant this last request, or refuse it, and pronounce a final judgment. Murray earnestly urged the necessity of a return to his government. From Mary no change of mind was to be expected. The regent was accordingly summoned before the Privy Council, and Cecil delivered to him and his associates the definitive sentence of Elizabeth. Its terms were most extraordinary. He stated, on one hand, that as Murray and his adherents had come into England, at the desire of the queen's majesty, to answer to

¹ Goodall, vol. ii. p. 301.

² Id. Ibid. pp. 304. January 9, 1568-9.

an accusation preferred by their sovereign, she was of opinion that nothing had as yet been brought forward against them which impaired their honour or allegiance. He declared, on the other hand, with regard to Mary, that nothing had been produced or shown by them against the queen their sovereign, which should induce the Queen of England, for any thing yet seen, to conceive an ill opinion of her good sister, and he concluded by informing Murray, that he should immediately receive permission to return to his government.¹ From this judgment, which was virtually an acquittal of Mary, it seems an inevitable inference, that the English Queen, after having had the most ample opportunities of examining the letters which had been produced, either considered them to be forgeries by the other party; or found that they had been so interpolated, garbled, and tampered with as to be unworthy of credit—for no one can deny, that if the letters were genuine, the Queen of Scots was guilty of the murder.

But if Mary was acquitted, Murray also was found guiltless, and these two conclusions, so utterly inconsistent with each other, Elizabeth had the hardihood to maintain. When we consider the solemnity of the cause, the length of the conferences, the direct accusation of Murray and his associates, the recrimination of the queen, the evidence produced, and the impossibility that both parties could be innocent, the sentence of Eliza-

¹ Goodall, vol. ii. p. 305, Jan. 10, 1568-9.

beth is perhaps the most absurd judicial opinion ever left upon record.

It was followed by a scene no less remarkable. A Privy Council was called at Hampton Court, on the eve of Murray's departure. It included the Duke of Norfolk, the Earls of Pembroke, Derby, Bedford, and Leicester, with Sir William Cecil, and Sir Walter Mildmay. Before it were summoned the Bishop of Ross and Lord Herries, on the one side. On the other came Murray, Morton, Lethington, Makgill, Orkney, Balnevis, and Buchanan; and when they were met, Cecil, rising up, delivered a message from the queen his mistress. She had determined, he said, to give the Earl of Murray and his adherents permission to depart for Scotland; but a rumour having arisen that they were concerned in the murder of the king, Murray had desired to be confronted with the deputies of the queen of Scots, and he now came there to know whether they would accuse him or his adherents, in their mistress's name or in their own.¹

To this challenge the queen of Scots' commissioners immediately answered, that in their own name they had affirmed, and would affirm, nothing, but, with respect to the queen their mistress, they had received her written instructions to accuse the Earl of Murray and his adherents as the principal authors, and some of them the actual perpetrators of the murder. They had communicated, they

¹ Goodall, vol. ii. p. 307.

said, their sovereign's letters on this point to the queen of England—they had publicly preferred their accusation, they had constantly adhered to it—they had offered to defend the innocence of their mistress, they had demanded in vain an inspection of the letters produced against her, and even now, if exact copies were furnished, they would undertake her defence, and demonstrate, by convincing proofs, what persons were indeed guilty of the murder of the king.¹ Murray strongly asserted his innocence, and offered to go to Bolton and abide in person the arraignment of his sovereign. It was answered, that such a step was wholly unnecessary, as her written accusation had been produced to the queen of England. Both parties then left the Council, and next day the regent received permission to return to Scotland, (Jan. 12.)²

It remained to dismiss their antagonists with an appearance of liberality, and being once more called before the Privy Council, Cecil intimated to them his mistress's consent, that the queen of Scots should have copies of the letters (the originals having been re-delivered to Murray), but he first required them to procure a declaration, under her seal and signature, that she would reply to the charges which they contained. It was answered, that Elizabeth had already two writings of the precise tenor required, under the queen's hand; to

¹ Id. vol. ii. p. 308.

² Id. Ibid. p. 309.

seek for more was only a vexatious delay. The whole proceedings, from first to last, had been partial and unjust. If the regent and his adherents were permitted to depart, why was their royal mistress, why were they themselves debarred from the same privilege? If the queen of England were really solicitous that she should enter upon her defence, let her adversaries be detained until it was concluded. To this spirited remonstrance, it was coldly and briefly replied, that Murray had promised to return when called for, as for the Scottish commissioners, they also would probably be allowed to depart, but for many reasons the queen of Scotland could not be suffered to leave England. Against this iniquitous sentence, no redress was to be hoped for; the deputies could only protest that nothing done by her in captivity should prejudice her honour, estate, or person, and having taken this final precaution, they left the council.¹

It is difficult from the conferences at York and Westminster, to draw any certain conclusion as to the probability of Mary's guilt or innocence. Both Elizabeth and the queen of Scots acted with great art, and throughout the discussions neither the professions of the one or of the other were sincere. Thus the English Queen, whilst she affected an extreme anxiety to promote a reconciliation between Mary and her subjects, was really desirous that the breach should be made irreconcilable, by the accusation of Murray, and the

¹ Goodall, vol. ii., pp. 310, 313.

production of the letters. Nor does there seem to be any doubt that Norfolk's assertion was correct, when he assured Lethington she had no intention of pronouncing a decision. On the other hand, it is clear that during the first part of the conferences, both Mary and her advisers, Ross, Herries, and Lethington, were, from whatever motive, anxious to suppress Murray's charge, that they deprecated the production of his evidence, and were only induced to go into the investigation from the hope which Elizabeth held out that she would not permit an accusation, but exert herself, under all circumstances, to promote a reconciliation between the Scottish Queen and her subjects, and restore her to the throne. It must have struck the reader, that whenever by means of the private letters which have been preserved, we get behind the scenes and are admitted to Mary's secret consultations with her commissioners, or to their own opinion on the conduct of the cause, we meet with no assertion of the forgery of the letters; and it seems to me difficult to reconcile her agreement to resign the crown, and suppress all enquiry, a measure only prevented by the interference of Norfolk, with her absolute innocence. On the other hand, there are some circumstances, especially occurring during the latter part of the conferences, which tell strongly in her favour. The urgency with which from first to last she solicited a personal interview with Elizabeth, and promised if it were granted to go into her

defence ; the public and oft-repeated assertion of the forgery of the letters, and the offer to prove this if copies were furnished to her commissioners ; Elizabeth's evasion of this request ; her entire suppression of these suspicious documents ; their subsequent disappearance ; and the schemes of Norfolk for a marriage with Mary ; these are all circumstances which seem to me exceedingly irreconcilable with her being directly guilty of the murder of her husband. Upon the whole, it appears to me, that in the present state of the controversy, we are really not in possession of evidence sufficient to enable any impartial enquirer to come to an absolute decision. I have already pointed out, as the circumstances occurred, such moral evidence against the queen as arose out of her conduct both before and after her marriage with Bothwell. The discussions at York and Westminster do not materially affect this evidence, either one way or the other, and, so far as we judge of these conferences by themselves, they leave the mind under the unsatisfying and painful impression that the conduct of the Scottish Queen throughout the whole investigation, was that of a person neither directly guilty, nor yet wholly innocent.

But, whilst animadverting on the proceedings of Elizabeth and Mary in these celebrated conferences, the conduct of the regent must not be forgotten. He was then perfectly aware of the accession of both Lethington and Morton to the murder of the king : this both prior and subsequent events proved ; yet

did he not scruple to bring these two accomplices to England, and employ Morton as his assistant in the accusation of his sovereign. Such a course, which could be dictated only by the ambition of retaining the whole power of the government in his hands, seems unworthy of the man who was the leader of the Reformation in Scotland, and professed an extraordinary regard for religion. It was cruel, selfish, and unprincipled—nor is this all. Making every allowance for the defective justice of the times, it is impossible to defend Murray's management of the evidence against Mary. There can be little doubt, I think, that some letters addressed by this unfortunate princess to Bothwell did really fall into the hands of her enemies, but the regent's refusal to produce the originals to the accused, and the state in which the copies have descended to our times, evidently garbled, altered, and interpolated, throws on him the utmost suspicion, and renders it impossible for any sincere enquirer after the truth to receive such evidence. If the only proofs of Mary's guilt had been these letters produced at Westminster, the task of her defenders would have been comparatively an easy one.¹ It is the moral

¹ I have purposely abstained from quoting or entering into the arguments of the writers in the controversy which has arisen on the subject of these letters, and of Mary's guilt or innocence. My object has been to attempt from original and unquestionable evidence to give the facts; not to overload the narrative with argument or controversy. The reader who may wish to pursue the points farther, will find ample room for study in the volumes of Goodall, of Tytler, my venerated grandfather, of Laing, Whitaker,

evidence arising out of her own conduct, which weighs heaviest against her. But to return.

Upon the conclusion of the conferences, the Scottish Queen exerted herself to rouse her partizans in Scotland and animate them to a vindication of their independence against the practices of Elizabeth. Acting by the advice of Cecil her chief minister, the Queen of England had formed a scheme by which, under the nominal regency of Murray, she would herself have managed the whole affairs of the country. The project drawn up in the handwriting of its astute author still exists; the young prince was to be delivered up by Murray, and educated in England under the eye of Elizabeth, the regent was to be continued in his office, receiving, of course, his instructions from the queen of England, on whom he was to be wholly dependant; and the queen of Scots was to be persuaded to remain where she was by arguments which Cecil minutely detailed.¹ These insidious proposals were discovered by Mary, and being communicated to her friends, exaggerated by her fears and indignation, raised the utmost alarm in Scotland. The regent, it was

and Chalmers. Upon the whole, my grandfather's "Historical and Critical Enquiry," as it appears in the 4th Edition, London, 1790, may still I think be appealed to, not only as the best defence of Mary, but, in a controversy which has been deformed by much coarse and bitter invective, as the most pleasing and elegant work which has appeared on the subject. It is throughout, the production of a scholar and a gentleman.

¹ MS. Brit. Mus. Caligula, C. 1, fol. 273, 22nd Dec., 1568.

said, had sold the country, he was ready to deliver up the principal fortresses, he had agreed to acknowledge the superiority of England, he looked himself to the throne, and was about to procure a deed of legitimation, by which he should be capable of succeeding if the young prince died without issue. Such reports flew from one end of the country to the other, and as he was not on the spot to contradict them, and cope with his adversaries, their effects were highly favourable to the captive queen.

In the mean time, although he had received permission to return to his Government, Murray, found himself very unpleasantly situated. He was deeply in debt, and although he had lent himself an easy tool in the hands of the queen of England, she refused to assist him. If, indeed, we may believe Sir James Melvil, who had an intimate personal acquaintance with the history of these times, she really despised him for his subserviency, and enjoyed his distresses. This was not all—the Duke of Norfolk was enraged at his late conduct. He had broken all the promises made to this nobleman, and as Norfolk commanded the whole strength of the northern counties, through which lay Murray's route homeward, he dreaded being way-laid before he crossed the border. Nor was such an apprehension without good foundation, as a plot for his assassination, of which it is said both Norfolk and Mary were cognizant, was actually organized, and the execution of it committed to the Earl of Westmore-

land.¹ Under these difficulties Murray had recourse to dissimulation. With much address he procured a reconciliation with Norfolk, expressed deep contrition for the part he had been compelled to act against his sovereign, and declared, that his feelings upon the subject of the marriage between her and the Duke remained unaltered: it was still his conviction, he said, that such a union would be eminently beneficial to both kingdoms, and he was ready to promote it by every means in his power. To prove his sincerity he opened the matter to the Bishop of Ross, he sent Robert Melvil to propose it to Mary herself, he promised to use his influence for its furtherance with the Scottish nobles, and in the end he so completely re-assured the Duke, that this nobleman procured the regent a loan of five thousand pounds from Elizabeth, and sent the strictest injunctions to his adherents not to molest him in any way upon his return.²

With Mary herself, his artifices did not stand him in less stead. Her friends in Scotland were at this time mustering in great strength. She had appointed the Duke of Chastelherault and the Earls of Argile and Huntly her lieutenants. The two earls commanded the north. The duke was ready to rise with the whole strength of the Hamiltons; Lord Boyd and other powerful nobles were preparing for action, and had these combined forces been brought into the field, Murray must

¹ Murdin's State Papers, p. 51.

² Lesly's Negotiations in Anderson vol. iii. p. 40.

have been overwhelmed. But at this crisis the queen and Norfolk were deceived by his professions of repentance, and Mary, trusting to his expressions of devotion to her interest, commanded her adherents to abstain from all hostilities. They reluctantly obeyed, and the regent, congratulating himself on his own address and the credulity of his opponents, returned secure and unmolested to his government.

On his arrival in Scotland Murray dropped the mask, and exerted himself with energy against his opponents. He held a convention of the nobility, clergy, and commissaries of the burghs at Stirling, he procured an approbation of his conduct, and a ratification of his proceedings in England,¹ and lastly he gave orders for a general muster of the force of the kingdom.¹

On the other hand, the Duke, Cassillis, and Lord Herries, as soon as they came home assumed a bold tone, issued a proclamation, in which the regent was branded as an usurper, mustered their strength, fortified their houses, and showed a determination to put all to the arbitrement of the sword. But the rapidity with which Murray assembled his army disconcerted them. It was evident, that although willing to enter into terms, he was better prepared than his opponents to act upon the offensive; and

¹ MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Murray to Cecil, 8th February, 1568-9. Ibid. Same to same. 17th February, 1568-9. Ibid. Same to same, 25th February, 1568-9. Ibid. Murray to Sir John Forster, 15th March, 1568-9.

after a personal conference with the regent at Glasgow (March 13) they concluded a treaty of peace.¹ It was agreed, that a convention of the nobility should be held upon the 10th of April for the settlement of the affairs of the country, and that in the mean season there should be a suspension of hostilities. Murray simply insisted that Chastelherault and his adherents should acknowledge the authority of the king. The Duke agreed to this, on condition that all who had been forfeited for their obedience to the queen, should be restored, that such measures should be taken for the maintenance of her honour and welfare as were consistent with the sovereignty of the king, and that a committee selected from the nobles on both sides should meet at Edinburgh to deliberate upon a general pacification. It embraced the regent himself, the Duke and the Earls of Huntly, Argyle, Morton, Mar, Athol, Glencairn, and Lord Herries. For his part, Murray stipulated that these noblemen should repair to Edinburgh and return to their estates in security, whilst they agreed to disband their forces and surrender themselves or their eldest sons as a security for the performance of the treaty.²

¹ Diurnal of Occurrents, p. 141. MS. Letter, St. P. Off. 13th March, 1568. Heads of the communing between the Earl of Murray on the one part, and the Earls of Cassilis and others on the other part.

² MS. Letter, St. P. Off. 15 March, 1568. Murray to Sir J. Forster.

A temporary tranquillity being thus restored, the leaders of both parties repaired to Stirling, where the Archbishop of St. Andrew's the Earl of Cassillis and Lord Herries placed themselves in Murray's hands as hostages, and the regent in return released the prisoners taken at the battle of Langside. It was expected that he would next disband his force, but seizing this moment of leisure, he led them against the border marauders, who, from the long interruption of justice in these districts, were become formidable to both kingdoms. His expedition was successful, and it was a politic stroke, for it afforded him a good excuse for keeping up his forces, and it taught them confidence in themselves and their leader. When he returned to the capital, it was with spirits animated by victory, and with a secret determination never to lay down his arms till he had compelled his enemies to submit to such terms as he was pleased to dictate.

The 10th of April, being the day for the convention of the nobles, now arrived, and according to agreement, the Duke, Cassillis, Herries, and other nobles who composed the committee, (Huntly and Argyle excepted), met at Edinburgh. Two points of much difficulty, and almost irreconcilable with each other, were to be settled—the continuance of the king's government, and the restoration and return of the captive queen; but Murray had no serious intention of entering into discussion upon either. When, therefore, the counsellors were assembled, he rose, and haughtily

handing a paper to the Duke of Chastelherault, desired him and his associates, before proceeding farther, to sign an acknowledgment of the king's authority. The duke remonstrated: the demand he said was unjust and premature, as the regent well knew. The object of this conference, was to deliberate on the measures to be adopted towards their captive sovereign, let him propose such measures himself, or listen to him and his friends when they brought them forward. If both parties were agreed upon them, he and his adherents were ready to subscribe to the king's authority—they had observed every article of the late treaty, they had trusted themselves in the regent's power; their hostages were in his hands, their lives and their lands at his disposal; but they had relied upon his honour most solemnly pledged, and signed, nor could they believe that he would disgrace himself by an act of fraud and tyranny. To this spirited remonstrance Murray did not vouchsafe an answer, but ordered his guards instantly to apprehend the Duke and Lord Herries. The last nobleman being the most formidable, was hurried a prisoner to the castle of Edinburgh without a moment's delay; the duke next morning shared the same fate.¹

This outrage was beheld with deep indignation by the country, and estranged from the regent some of his best friends, but it intimidated his opponents, and rendered Argyle and Huntly more inclined to

¹ Melvil's Memoirs, p. 219. History of James the Sext. MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Herries to Elizabeth, 5 July, 1569, pp. 39, 40.

an accommodation. These noblemen wielded the whole power of the northern districts, and had refused to sign the pacification at Glasgow. So deep was their enmity to Murray, that they had accused him in a public paper, presented during the conferences at Westminster, of being accessory to the murder of the king, and since that time they had left nothing undone to support the interests of their sovereign, and destroy the authority of the regent. But the late scenes in the capital had alarmed them; they saw him supported by England; at the head of a large force; his opponents in prison; the southern part of the kingdom reduced to obedience; and they deemed it prudent to enter into an accommodation. Argyle consented to acknowledge the king's authority, and was immediately received into favour. With Huntly, who had acted more independently for the queen, and granted commissions in her name, the arrangement was more difficult. But at last all was settled in a meeting at St. Andrew's, and the northern lord subscribed his adherence to the government, surrendered his artillery, and delivered hostages for his peaceable behaviour (10th May).¹ To secure his advantage, the regent immediately led his army into the North, reduced the country, levied heavy fines on all who had risen in favour of the queen, compelled the clans to swear allegiance, and returned enriched and confident, to hold a great

¹ MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Lord Hunsdon to Cecil, May 19, 1569, and Spottiswood, p. 229.

convention of the nobility, which he had appointed to meet at Perth on the 25th of July.¹

To explain the object of this assembly, we must look back for a moment, and recal to mind the intrigues which had taken place between Murray, Lethington, and the Duke of Norfolk, to bring about a marriage between this nobleman and the Scottish Queen. The project had originated in the busy and politic brain of Lethington, it had been encouraged and furthered by the regent, and its success was ardently anticipated by the duke, who carried on a correspondence with Murray upon the subject, and trusted in the end to procure the consent of his own sovereign. A secret of this kind, however, is difficult to keep in a court; and something coming to Elizabeth's ears, she broke forth with much passion, and attacked the duke, who saved himself by his address. He would admit, he said, that proposals had been made to him on the subject by some noblemen. These he could not have prevented, but he had never seriously entertained them, and indeed, he was not likely to do so, as he loved to sleep upon a safe pillow.² His earnestness re-assured Elizabeth, and Norfolk believing that he had lulled all her suspicions, had the rashness and folly to continue his correspondence with Mary.

After some time, the scheme assumed a definite

¹ MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Murray to Cecil, Aberdeen, July 8, 1569.

² Trial of the Duke of Norfolk, Jardine, vol. i., p. 162.

form, and was secretly supported by a large party of the nobility in both countries. Leicester earnestly promoted it, the Earls of Arundel, Pembroke, Bedford, Shrewsbury, Northumberland, and Westmoreland, gave it their full concurrence. Sir Nicholas Throckmorton laboured warmly in the cause; even the cautious Cecil, to whom it was early communicated, contributed his advice.¹

In Scotland the plan was managed by Lethington, the regent, and his secretary Wood, whilst the Bishop of Ross, and the Lord Boyd, communicated with Mary, who corresponded with the duke, and professed her readiness to be divorced from Bothwell. Nothing in short was wanting, but the consent of Elizabeth, and the concurrence of the Scottish nobility. To conciliate and convince the English Queen, Leicester proposed that Lethington should repair to England. To ensure the second, it was resolved that the matter should be brought before that convention of the whole nobility, which was to meet at Perth on Murray's return from the North.

In the meantime whilst these secret transactions were carefully concealed, the Bishop of Ross, who remained in England, carried on an open negotiation for his mistress's restoration. To this Elizabeth, with the desire of keeping a check over Murray, affected to listen, and Lord Boyd was despatched with some proposals on this subject, to

¹ Lealy's *Negotiations*, Anderson, vol. iii., pp. 51, 61, 62. Camden's *Elizabeth*, Kennet, vol. ii. p. 420.

be communicated first to Mary herself, and afterwards when she had given her consent, to be broken to the Scottish nobility. These articles, Camden affirms, were drawn up by Leicester.¹ They stipulated that the Scottish Queen, on condition of being reinstated in the government of her kingdom, should enter into a perpetual league with England, establish the Protestant religion, receive to favour her rebellious subjects, and give assurance to Elizabeth that neither she nor her issue should be molested by any claims upon the English throne. Another article was added on the marriage with Norfolk, but was carefully concealed from the English Queen. It recommended this union, as the only measure which was likely to restore tranquillity to both kingdoms, and to enforce it more effectually, Leicester and his friends despatched a special messenger, Mr. Candish, who accompanied Lord Boyd to Tutbury, and carried letters and costly presents to Mary.² To some of the conditions she immediately consented, on others she demurred and requested time to consult her foreign allies, as to the projected marriage; her sorrowful experience, she said, inclined her to prefer a solitary life, yet if the remaining conditions were settled to her satisfaction, she was not indisposed to Norfolk, provided Elizabeth were consulted and her consent obtained.³

¹ Camden's Elizabeth. Kennet, vol. ii. pp. 419-420.

² Lesly's Negociation. Anderson, vol. iii. pp. 51, 52.

³ Lesly's Negociations, p. 53, 54.

On receiving this favourable reply, Norfolk became impatient to complete his ambitious project. He courted popularity, kept open house, strengthened himself by every possible means, and communicated his design to the French and Spanish ambassadors, who after consulting their courts, gave him their encouragement and support. Nor did he neglect the Scottish Regent, with whom he kept up a close correspondence, and who assured him of his continued fidelity and devotion to his service. It may seem strange that Norfolk should have so long delayed to sound Elizabeth upon his great design, but Leicester, in whom he chiefly confided, strongly dissuaded him from any premature disclosure, and the deeper he and his confederates were engaged in their secret intrigues, the more they shrunk from the dreaded task of revealing them to a princess whose violence and severity held them in constant awe.

Meanwhile, though kept in the dark as to the marriage, the English Queen was urged to conclude an agreement for the restoration of Mary on the ground of those articles which had been submitted to her by the Bishop of Ross, and after a conference with her privy council, Lord Boyd was dispatched upon this business into Scotland.¹ This nobleman carried with him letters to the regent from Elizabeth, Mary, the Duke of Norfolk, and Sir Nicholas Throckmorton, and meeting Murray at Elgin,

¹ Lealy's Negotiations, Anderson, vol. iii. p. 54, 55.

on his return from his northern expedition, he immediately laid before him his dispatches and instructions.¹ The letters of Elizabeth contained three propositions in Mary's behalf, and she intimated her desire that one or the other of them should be adopted. She might be restored, she said, fully and absolutely to her royal estate—or, secondly, she might be united in the government with her son, and retain the title of queen, whilst the administration continued in the regent till the prince had attained the age of seventeen—or lastly, she might return to Scotland, as a private person, and be honourably maintained in quiet and retirement. In Mary's own letter, which was brought by Lord Boyd, she briefly intimated her desire that judges should be appointed to decide upon the lawfulness of her marriage with Bothwell, and should it be pronounced illegal, her request was, that sentence of nullity should be pronounced, so that she might be free to marry where she pleased. This request evidently pointed to the projected union with Norfolk, and the subject was insisted on in the letters of the duke himself and Sir N. Throckmorton. Norfolk, in addressing the regent, contented himself with warm professions of friendship, and assured him that as to his marriage with the queen his sister, he never meant to recede from his promise, having proceeded so far that he could not go back without dishonour. He referred him to Lord Boyd, who was fully instructed by Mary and

¹ Lesly's Negotiations, Anderson, vol. iii. p. 70.

himself to reply to any doubts which he might entertain, and begged him to believe that he felt for him the affection not only of a faithful friend, but a natural brother.¹

Throkmorton's letters were addressed both to Murray and to Lethington. To the regent he observed, that the time was come when he must give up all his conscientious scruples and objections. The match was now supported by a party too powerful and too numerous to be resisted. If he opposed it, his overthrow was inevitable. If he promoted it, no man's friendship would be so highly prized, no man's estimation be greater or more popular. In his letter to Lethington, Throkmorton urged the necessity of his hastening to court for the purpose of breaking the affair to Elizabeth. Of her consent, he said, he need have no doubt. She was too wise a princess to risk the tranquillity of her government, her own security, and the happiness of her people for the gratification of her own fancy, or the passions of any inconsiderate individual, and he concluded by assuring him, that the wisest, noblest, and mightiest persons in England were all engaged upon their side.

On receiving these letters, the regent, as we have seen, summoned a convention of the nobility at Perth, on the 25th of July; an assembly of the church was held at the same time in the capital, and commissioners deputed from it to the meeting of the nobles. It was impossible, so acute a person as

¹ Haynes, p. 520.

Murray should fail to perceive that the queen's restoration and the proposed marriage, if carried into effect, must be a death blow to his power, and whilst he affected to fulfil his engagements to the duke with scrupulous fidelity, he secretly persuaded his partizans to oppose the match with their utmost influence.¹

When Boyd delivered his letters at the convention, containing Elizabeth's three proposals, the effect of this disingenuous dealing was perceived: Mary's full restoration to her dignity was refused, her association with the young king in the government was also declared dangerous and impossible, but the third scheme for her restoration to liberty, and being reduced to a private condition within her dominions, appeared to them more likely to succeed. The assembly, however, arrived at no definite resolution, and when the queen's letter regarding a divorce from Bothwell was laid before them, a violent debate arose between Lethington and his friends, who secretly supported the intended marriage with Norfolk, and Makgill, the clerk register, with the leaders of the Presbyterian party. It was argued by the secretary, between whom and Murray there had recently been great coldness, that the divorce might be concluded without injury or disrespect either to the king or the church. To this Makgill answered, that Mary's own letters confuted him, and insulted

¹ Lesly's Negotiations, Anderson, vol. iii. p. 71. MS. St. P. Off. Names of the noblemen, &c., assembled at Perth, 28 July, 1569.

their sovereign. The king was their only head and master, yet she still addressed them as her subjects, and subscribed herself their queen. The Bishop of St. Andrew's was a heretic, a member cut off from the true vine, an obstinate rebel and papist, yet she wrote to him as the head of the church. To vouchsafe an answer to such an application, would be, in some measure, to admit its justice—to grant it, nothing less than treason and blasphemy. It was in vain that Lethington attempted a reply, and sarcastically insinuated that they who were so recently anxious for the queen's separation from Bothwell, had now altered their tone with unaccountable versatility. He was interrupted by Richardson, the treasurer, who started from his seat, calling the assembly to witness that the secretary had argued against the king's authority, and protested that any who dared to support him should be accounted traitors and dealt with accordingly. This appeal finished the controversy, and Mary's proposal for a divorce was indignantly rejected.¹ The assembly then broke up, with mutual expressions of contempt and defiance, the queen's deliverance appearing still more distant than before.

But if the affairs of this unfortunate princess were thus unsuccessful in her own dominions, an event which now happened in England overwhelmed her with fresh affliction. The renewed

¹ MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Lord Hunadon to Cecil. Berwick, 5th Aug. 1569. James the Sext, p. 41.

intrigues of the Duke of Norfolk were discovered, and Elizabeth's suspicions being once awakened, she never rested till, by the assistance of Cecil, her indefatigable and vigilant minister, the whole plot was unravelled.¹ These discoveries were made when the duke scarcely suspected it, till he was awakened from his security by some dark speeches of the queen, who taunted him with his high hopes, and bade him beware on what pillow he leant his head.² But this moderate tone of reprehension was short-lived, for on ascertaining the extent to which the plot had been carried under her own eye, by her principal nobility, and without a pretence of soliciting her consent, Elizabeth's fury was ungovernable. Leicester and his associates hastened to propitiate her resentment by a full discovery, and basely purchased their own security with the betrayal of Norfolk. His example was followed by Murray, who with equal meanness, on the first challenge of the English Queen, delivered up the whole of his secret correspondence with Norfolk, and excused himself by declaring that a fear of assassination had compelled him to join a conspiracy, of which he secretly disapproved.³ He pleaded also, and with some reason, that Elizabeth's own conduct was enough to mitigate her

¹ Maitland, vol. ii. p. 1090.

² Spottiswood, p. 231.

³ MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Murray to Cecil. Hawick, 22 Oct. 1569, Trial of the Duke of Norfolk, in Jardine, vol. i. p. 157-160.

resentment. If she had adopted a decided part against Mary, they would have known how to receive Norfolk's proposals—but her vacillating policy, and the favour with which the captive queen was treated, created, he said, an equal uncertainty in his mind, and that of his supporters.¹

As for the unfortunate Duke himself, he appears to have acted with that indecision which in matters of this kind, and with such an adversary as Elizabeth, is commonly fatal. His friends admonished him to throw off the mask and take the field at once, and had he followed their advice his popularity was so great that the consequences might have been serious; but he rejected their advice, and in an apology addressed to the queen, assured her that it had been his fixed resolution throughout the whole course of the negotiations never to marry the queen of Scots without the consent of his sovereign. His guilt lay in the delay, but his allegiance was untainted, and his devotion to her service as entire as it had always been. This letter was sent from Kenninghall, his seat in Norfolk, to which he had precipitately retired on his first suspicion of a discovery. Elizabeth's reply was an immediate summons to the court. The Duke did not venture to obey without first consulting Cecil. The secretary assured him that he was safe. He complied, and was instantly arrested and lodged in the Tower.²

¹ MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Murray to Cecil, Dumfries, 29 Oct. 1569.

² Haynes, pp. 528, 533.

The discovery was followed by a more rigorous confinement of the Scottish Queen, who was now removed from Winkfield to Tutbury, her repositories were ransacked for letters, and she was committed to the custody of the Earl of Huntingdon, a nobleman particularly obnoxious to her, who was associated in this charge with Shrewsbury her former keeper.¹ Her most trusty domestics were dismissed, the number of her attendants diminished, her letters intercepted and conveyed to the queen of England, and all her actions so rigorously watched, that it became impossible for her to communicate even in the most common affairs with her friends.²

Nothing can more strongly mark the sudden and extraordinary changes of these times than an event which soon after occurred in Scotland—the arraignment of Lethington. The regent, since the discovery of his intrigues with Norfolk, had fallen into suspicion with Elizabeth. His secretary Wood, also, who had been entrusted with his negotiations at the English court, by his duplicity and false dealing had incurred her resentment; and although Murray hastened to appease her, by a delivery of the letters which convicted the Duke, she was aware that Lethington still intrigued upon the subject, and suspected that the regent, from their long habits of intimacy, might be induced to favour his designs. Her fears, indeed, on this point, proved

¹ Haynes, pp. 526-527.

² Lesly's Negotiations. Anderson, vol. iii. p. 78.

to be unfounded, for Murray, as we learn from Melvil, had recently forsaken his old friends and suffered himself to be surrounded by a circle of base and needy parasites. But of this estrangement Elizabeth was ignorant. She therefore directed Cecil to keep a vigilant eye upon the operations of the regent; Lord Hunsdon, the governor of Berwick, received the same instructions; the proceedings of the convention at Perth and the subsequent conduct of the Scottish governor were severely criticised, and he found to his mortification that whilst he had incurred extreme odium by the betrayal of Norfolk, he was himself an object of suspicion.

Whilst Elizabeth, however, only suspected Murray, she was incensed to the highest degree against Lethington, whom she now discovered to be the originator of the marriage plot and the greatest partizan of Norfolk. This restless and indefatigable politician, since his unsuccessful efforts in the convention at Perth, had sought security in Athol, where he was surrounded by his friends, and continued to incite them to renew their exertions in favour of the Scottish Queen; and Murray, who like other victims of ambition, had become sufficiently unscrupulous in the means which he adopted to consolidate his power, resolved to recommend himself to Elizabeth by the ruin of his former associate.

Under the pretence of requiring his immediate assistance at Stirling, in the business of the government, he requested the secretary to leave his retreat in Athol and return to court. Suspi-

cious of some intrigue, he obeyed with reluctance, and scarce had he taken his seat at Council, which was attended by Murray, Mar, Morton, Athol, and Semple, when word was brought that Crawford, a gentleman from the Earl of Lennox, requested audience on business of moment. He was admitted, and falling down on his knees, demanded justice to be done on William Maitland, of Lethington, and Sir James Balfour, as the murderers of their sovereign.¹ Amongst the councillors, the only one who heard this sudden accusation unmoved was the secretary himself. With a smile of calm contempt he observed, that his long continued services might have exempted him from so foul and false a charge, preferred, too, by so mean a person, but he was ready to find surety to stand his trial on any day which was appointed and he had no fears for the verdict. Crawford, however, still kneeling, warmly remonstrated against his being left at large. He, a gentleman, and a servant of the late king,² had publicly arraigned that guilty man of treason, he was ready to prosecute and adduce his proofs, and under such circumstances he appealed to the council whether bail could possibly be accepted. After a violent debate it was determined, that the secretary should be committed, and Murray, who secretly congratulated himself on the issue of his intrigue, carried him to the capital and confined him in the

¹ MS. Letter, St. P. Off. B. C. Lord Hunsdon to Cecil. Newcastle, Sept. 7th, 1569. Diurnal of Occurrents, p. 147, 148.

² Supra, p. 79.

house of Forrester one of his own dependants. At the same time a party of horse were dispatched to Fife, who surrounded Balfour's residence at Monymeil, and brought him and his brother George prisoners to Edinburgh.¹

The arrest of Lethington increased the unpopularity of the regent; but his victim had scarcely fallen into his hands ere he was again torn from him; for the secretary's old associate Grange, dreading some new treachery of Murray and Morton, now closely leagued together, attacked the house in which he was confined, and, by a mixture of stratagem and courage,² carried him off in triumph to the castle. This rescue deeply mortified Murray, who believed that in securing Lethington he was not only performing an acceptable service to Elizabeth, but removing the most formidable opponent of his own government. He dissembled his indignation, however, and as the secretary still declared his readiness to answer the accusation, contented himself with appointing the 22nd of Nov. as the day of trial.

Meanwhile England became disturbed by a rebellion in the northern counties, which at first assumed a formidable appearance. Its leaders were

¹ MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Murray to Cecil, Stirling, Sept. 5th, 1569. Also Lord Hunsdon to Cecil, Alnwick Sept. 8th, 1569, *Diurnal of Occurrents*, pp. 147-8.

² Melvil's *Memoirs*, p. 218. It is stated by Robert Melvil, that Grange, to forward his purpose, forged an order under the handwriting of the regent. MS. Declaration of Robert Melvil in the *Hope-toun Papers*.

the Earls of Northumberland and Westmoreland, its object no less than the restoration of the Roman Catholic faith, the destruction of the Protestant constitution of that country, and the delivery of the Scottish Queen. So imminent did the danger at first appear, that Elizabeth issued an order under the great seal for Mary's execution, which seems only to have been arrested by the sudden and total failure of the insurrection.¹ It arose from the intrigues of the Duke of Norfolk and the hopes excited amongst the English Romanists by the anticipated restoration of Mary. Amongst Norfolk's most powerful friends were the Earls of Northumberland and Westmoreland, two peers of ancient family, great alliance, and steady attachment to the Romish church. They commanded the strength of the northern counties, and, had Norfolk chosen to have bid defiance to Elizabeth, they were ready to have risen in arms in his defence. His submission and imprisonment broke, but did not put an end to, their intrigues, and irritated at his desertion they sought the support of the King of Spain, and secured the services of the Duke of Alva and the Bishop of Ross.

This prelate, a man of great talents and restless intrigue, was the ambassador and confidential minister of the Scottish Queen, and by his secret negotiations his mistress, who in her first imprisonment at Bolton had kept up a correspondence with Northumberland,² became involved in these new

¹ See Proofs and Illustrations, No. 3. Letter of Leicester to Cecil, communicated by Mr. Bruce.

² Haynes, p. 694-695.

commotions. Alva promised to assist the two Earls with a large body of men, and sent over the Marquis Vitelli, one of his best officers, under the pretence of a mission to Elizabeth, but really to forward the rebellion. Before, however, these preparations were completed, Elizabeth obtained a knowledge of the plot, and instantly summoned both to court. Whilst they hesitated, intelligence arrived that Sussex, the queen's lieutenant in the north, had received orders to arrest them, and scarce was this message delivered when Northumberland's castle was beset by a body of horse. He escaped with difficulty, joined the Earl of Westmoreland, and, as the only chance now left them, they dropped the mask and broke into rebellion. An enterprise thus prematurely forced on, could scarcely be successful. In their proclamation the two earls professed a devoted attachment to the queen's person, and declared their only object to be the restoration of the faith of their fathers, the dismissal of false councillors, and the liberation of Norfolk. They had confidently looked to being joined by the large body of the English Roman Catholics all over the country, but their utmost strength never amounted to six thousand men, and these soon melted away into a more insignificant force. Sir John Forster, the Warden of the Middle Marches, made himself master of Northumberland's castles of Alnwick and Warkworth, and by taking possession of the principal passes, effectually cut off all communication between the earl and his vassals

in those parts. Thence marching to Newcastle, and being joined by Sir Henry Percy, Northumberland's brother, he speedily reduced the rebels in the northern parts of Durham, so that when Sussex took the field with seven thousand men, the rebellion was already expiring.¹

The two rebel earls, with a force which diminished every hour, retired first upon Hexham, and afterwards fell back upon Naworth Castle, in Cumberland. Here they suddenly dispersed their little army, and fled with a handful of horse into Scotland. Westmoreland took refuge with the lairds of Buccleugh and Farnyhurst, two of the most powerful chiefs in those parts, whilst Northumberland, in company with black Ormiston, a traitor who was present at the king's murder, the Laird's Jock, and other border banditti, threw himself into the Harlaw, a stronghold of the Armstrongs.² These events passed with so much rapidity, that Murray, who, on the first intelligence of the insurrection, had professed his readiness to assist Elizabeth with the whole forces of the realm, was scarcely able to muster his strength before he heard that assistance was unnecessary.

From such commotions in England, so intimately connected with the fortunes of the captive queen,

¹ Lingard, vol. viii. pp. 52, 58. Camden, in Kennett, vol. ii. pp. 421, 422.

² Copy of the time. St. P. Off. Instructions for Mr. Cary. Signed by Sussex, Hunsdon, and Saddler. 22nd Dec. 1569. Also MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Copy of the time. Murray to Sussex. Peebles, 22nd December, 1569.

we must turn to the condition of her partizans in her own country. Of these the great leaders were Lethington and Grange. Grange was in possession of the Castle of Edinburgh, within which now lay his friend Lethington, Lord Herriès, the Archbishop of St. Andrew's, and others who supported the cause of Mary, professing, at the same time, their attachment to their prince, and an earnest desire for the pacification of the country.

Opposed to them was the Regent, supported by England and the party of the Kirk, who kept up a constant correspondence with Cecil, Elizabeth's minister, and whose measures were entirely dictated and overruled by English influence.

Since his accession to the chief power in the state, but more especially since the termination of the conferences at Westminster, Murray's popularity had been on the decline. Men blamed his conduct to his sovereign, his treachery to his associates, his haughtiness to his own countrymen, his humility and subserviency to a foreign power, as England was then considered. They accused him of being surrounded by troops of low and needy flatterers, who prospered upon the ruin of the ancient nobility, and persuaded him to betray his former friends, by whose efforts he had been placed in the regency. They declared, and with some truth, that having once sold himself to England, he had become insensible to every suggestion of honour and good faith. Hence his betrayal of Norfolk, his imprisonment of Herries and the

Duke of Chastelherault, his treacherous accusation of Lethington, his threatened severity to Northumberland—all this weighed strongly against him, and those who had been most willing to anticipate the happiest results from his administration, were now ready to acknowledge their mortification and disappointment.¹ Yet, although thus fallen in public estimation, and surrounded by enemies, Murray, naturally daring and intrepid, showed no symptoms of decreasing energy ; and as the time approached when Lethington was to stand his trial for the murder of the king, he appeared fully determined to insist on the prosecution.

When the day arrived, however, a scene presented itself very different from the pacific solemnities of public justice ; Lord Home, at an early hour, occupied the city with a large body of horse. He was speedily followed by multitudes of the secretary's friends, all armed and surrounded by their retainers ; and as every hour was increasing the concourse, Morton, a principal accuser of Lethington, refused to risk his person within the city. Amidst this warlike concourse, Clement Little, an able advocate of the time, entered where the Council had assembled, and protested, that, as his client, the secretary, was ready to stand his trial, and no prosecutor had appeared, he was entitled to a verdict of acquittal. Murray, however, who had taken care to be strongly guarded, rose up, and declared, that as long as

¹ Melvil's Memoirs, p. 220.

the town was occupied by armed troops, no trial should take place, and no verdict be pronounced. He had been placed, he said, by their unsolicited suffrages, in the first office in the state ; he had given his solemn oath to administer justice ; they had promised to obey the king, and assist him in maintaining the law. What, then, meant this armed assembly ? Was it thus they fulfilled their promise ? or did they think to intimidate him into their opinion. That, at least, he should show them was a vain expectation, and therefore he now prorogued the trial till quiet was restored, and they were prepared, having laid aside their arms, to resume the demeanour of peaceable subjects. Such was Murray's speech, as reported by himself in a letter written next day to Cecil ; but we learn, from the same source, that the regent was daily expecting a communication from Elizabeth, containing her instructions how to conduct himself in Lethington's case, and that he delayed the trial to give time for their arrival—an additional proof of his entire subserviency to England.¹

He concluded the same letter by an allusion to the recent rebellion in the north :—“ I have offered,” said he, “ already to Mr. Marshall, of Berwick, (he meant Sir William Drury) to take such part in her highness' cause and quarrel with the whole power of this realm, that will do for me, as he shall advertise

¹ MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Murray to Cecil, Edinburgh, 22nd November, 1569, indorsed in Cecil's hand, “ Earl of Murray to me concerning the day of law for Lydington.”

me * * * and since the matter not only touches her highness obedience, but that we may see our own destruction compassed, who are professors of the Gospel, let not time drive, but with speed let us understand her Majesty's mind."¹

Murray followed up this offer by summoning the whole force of the kingdom to meet him in arms at Peebles on the 20th December, for the defence of their native country, the preservation of their wives and children, and the liberty of the true religion.² He had received early intelligence from Sussex of the flight of the rebel earls into Scotland, and immediately dispatched messengers to the sea-ports to keep a strict look-out, lest any should take shipping and escape; but his chief reliance lay in his own activity, and marching rapidly towards Hawick, he beset the Harlaw, a tower in which Northumberland had found shelter from Hecky, or Hector Armstrong, a border thief. This villain, bribed by the regent's gold, sold the English earl to Murray, who carried him to Edinburgh, and soon after imprisoned him in Lochleven.³

Although this new act of severity and corruption increased the regent's unpopularity in Scotland, it

¹ MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Murray to Cecil, Edin. 22nd November, 1569.

² MS. St. P. Off. Copy. The Regent's Proclamation, Edinb. 18th December, 1569.

³ Diurnal of Occurrents, p. 154. Lesly's Negotiations, p. 83. Anderson, vol. iii. Hence a border proverb, "To take Hecky's cloak," to betray a friend. Percy's Reliques, vol. i. p. 3. song iv.

being suspected that he meant to give up his captive to Elizabeth, his zeal and activity completely restored him to the good opinion of this princess, and he had the satisfaction to learn, that she had warmly commended him to his ambassador the Abbot of Dumfermling. This emboldened him to make a proposal on which he had long meditated, and for which the English Queen was by no means prepared. It was no less than that she should surrender Mary into his hands to be kept safely in Scotland, a solemn promise being given by him, "that she should live her natural life, without any sinister means taken to shorten the same."¹ It was added that a maintenance suitable to her high rank should be provided for her, and the arguments addressed to Elizabeth upon the subject, in a paper entrusted to Nicholas Elphinston, who was sent with the request to the English court, were drawn up with no little art and ability. After an enumeration of the late miseries and commotions in England, it stated, that "as Mary was notoriously the ground and fountain from whom all these tumults, practices, and daily dangers did flow," and as her remaining within the realm of England undoubtedly

¹ Copy of the "Instrument." MS. St. P. Off., but without date. On the back are these names in Cecil's hand,

Er: MURRAY,
MORTON,
MAR,
GLENCAIRN,
MONTROSE, M.

Er: MARSHALL, M.
Lr: LYNDSEY,
RUTHVEN,
SEMPLE.

gave her every opportunity to continue them, there was no more certain means to provide a remedy, and bring quiet to both countries, than to bring her back into Scotland, thus removing her to a greater distance from foreign realms, and daily intelligence with their princes or their ambassadors.”¹

In this petition Murray was joined by Morton, Mar, Glencairn, Lords Lindsay, Ruthven, and Semple, with the Masters of Marshall and Montrose. At the same time Knox addressed a letter to Cecil. He described himself as writing with one foot in the grave, alluded to the late rebellion, and recommended him to strike at the root, meaning Mary, if he would prevent the branches from budding again. It appears to me that the expressions of this great reformer, whose stern spirit was little softened by age, go as far as to urge the absolute necessity of putting Mary to death, but his words are somewhat dark and enigmatical. The letter, which is wholly in his own hand, is too remarkable to be omitted.

“Benefits of God’s hands received, crave that men be thankful, and danger known would be avoided. If ye strike not at the root, the branches that appear to be broken will bud again, and that more quickly than men can believe, with greater force than we would wish. Turn your een² unto your God. Forget yourself and yours, when consultation is to be had in matters of such weight, as presently ly upon you. Albeit I have been fre-

¹ MS. Copy, *ibid.* ut supra.

² Eyes.

medly¹ handled, yet was I never enemy to the quietness of England. God grant you wisdom. In haste, of² Edinburgh, the 2d of Janur. Yours to command in God,

“ John Knox, with his one foot in the grave.”

“ Mo⁴ days than one would not suffice to express what I think.”

Murray dispatched Elphinston on the 2d of January, and as Knox's letter was dated on the same day, and related to the same subject, it is probable he carried it with him.⁶ The envoy, who was in great confidence with the regent, and a man of talent, received full instructions for his secret mission, which fortunately have been preserved. He was directed to impress upon Elizabeth in the strongest manner, the difficulties with which Murray was surrounded, the daily increasing power of his and her enemies, who supported the cause of the captive queen both in England and Scotland, the perpetual tumults and intrigues of the Roman Catholics in both realms, their intercourse with Philip of Spain and the Pope, who were animating them at that very moment to new exertions, the succours hourly looked for from France, and the utter impossibility of the regent keeping up the

Strangely.

² At.

³ MS. Letter, St. P. Off. John Knox to Cecil. Edinburgh, 2d January, 1569-70. Endorsed by Cecil's Clerk, “ Mr. Knox to my Mr.”

⁴ More.

⁵ MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Murray to Cecil, Jan. 2, 1569-70.

struggle against his opponents, if Mary was permitted to remain in England, and Elizabeth did not come forward with more prompt and effectual assistance.

It was necessary, he said, to prevent the ruin of the cause, that the queen of England and his master should distinctly understand each other. She had lately urged him to deliver up her rebel the Earl of Northumberland, to pay the penalty of a traitor. It was a hard request, and against every feeling of honour and humanity, to surrender a banished man to slaughter, but he was ready to consent, if in exchange the queen of Scots were committed into his hands, and if at the same time, Elizabeth would support the cause of his young sovereign, and the interests of true religion, by an immediate advance of money, and a seasonable present of arms and ammunition.¹ If this were agreed to, then he was ready to continue his efforts for the maintenance of the Government in Scotland against the machinations of their enemies; he would not only preserve her amity, but “would serve her majesty in England, as they are accustomed to do their native princes in Scotland, and out of England, upon reasonable wages.” If she would not consent to this, then he must forbear any longer to venture his life as he had done, and it would be well for her to consider what dangers might ensue to both the realms, by the in-

¹ MS. St. P. Off. A Note of the principal matters in Nicholas Elphinston's Instructions. Wholly in Cecil's hand, Jan. 19, 1569.

crease of the factions which favoured papistry and the queen of Scots' title. Above all he entreated her to remember (alluding as it appears to me, to the subject of Knox's letter), that the heads of all these troubles were at her commandment, that this late rebellion was not now ended, but had more dangerous branches, for which, if she did not provide a remedy, the fault must lie upon herself.¹

These secret negotiations were detected by the vigilance of the Bishop of Ross, and he instantly presented a protest to the queen of England against a proposition, which, if agreed to was, he said, equivalent to signing Mary's death warrant. He solicited also the ambassadors of France and Spain to remonstrate against it, and La Motte Fenelon addressed an earnest letter to the Queen mother upon the subject.² Some little time, too, was gained by the refusal of the Scottish nobles to deliver up Northumberland, and Elizabeth had dispatched Sir Henry Gates and the Marshal of Berwick with a message to the regent, when an appalling event suddenly interrupted the treaty. This was the murder of Murray himself in the town of Linlithgow, by James Hamilton of Bothwellhaugh.

The assassination is to be chiefly traced to the influence of private revenge ; but there is no doubt also, that the author of the deed was the tool of a

¹ MS. St. P. Off. A note of the principal matters in Nicholas Elphinston's Instructions, January 19, 1569.

² Lesly's Negotiations, p. 84. Anderson, vol. iii. Also *Dépêches de la Motte Fenelon*, vol. ii., pp. 389, 390.

faction which had long determined on Murray's destruction. He was a gentleman of good family, had been made prisoner at Langside, and with others was condemned to death, but the regent had spared his life, and been satisfied with the forfeiture of his estate.

His wife was heiress of Woodhouselee, a small property on the river Esk, to which she had retreated, under the mistaken idea that it would be exempted from the sentence of outlawry, which affected her husband's estate of Bothwellhaugh. But Bellenden, the justice clerk, a favourite of Murray's, who had obtained a grant of the escheat,¹ violently occupied the house and barbarously turned its mistress, during a bitterly cold night, and almost in a state of nakedness, into the woods, where she was found in the morning furiously mad, and insensible to the injury which had been inflicted on her. If ever revenge could meet with sympathy it would be in so atrocious a case as this; and from that moment Bothwellhaugh resolved upon Murray's death, accusing him as the chief author of the calamity. It is affirmed by Calderwood, that he had twice failed in his sanguinary purpose, when the Hamiltons, who had long hated the regent, encouraged him to make a third attempt, which proved successful.²

Nothing could be more deliberate than the man-

¹ The forfeited property.

² MS. Calderwood, Ayscough, 4735, pp. 746, 747.

ner in which he proceeded. Murray, who was at Stirling, intended to pass through Linlithgow, on his way to Edinburgh. In this town, and in the High Street, through which the cavalcade generally passed, was a house belonging to the archbishop, his uncle. Here he took his station in a small room or wooden gallery, which commanded a full view of the street. To prevent his heavy footsteps being heard, for he was booted and spurred, he placed a featherbed on the floor; to secure against any chance observation of his shadow, which, had the sun broke out, might have caught the eye, he hung up a black cloth on the opposite wall, and, having barricaded the door in the front, he had a swift horse ready saddled in the stable at the back. Even here his preparations did not stop, for, observing that the gate in the wall which enclosed the garden was too low to admit a man on horseback, he removed the lintel stone, and returning to his chamber cut in the wooden panel, immediately below the lattice window where he watched, a hole just sufficient to admit the barrel of his caliver.¹ Having taken these precautions he loaded the piece with four bullets and calmly awaited his victim.

The regent had received repeated warnings of his danger; and on the morning of the murder, John Hume, an attached follower, implored him not to ride through the principal street, but pass round by the back of the town, promising to bring him to the very spot where they might seize the

¹ History of King James the Sext, p. 46.

villain who lay in wait for him.¹ He agreed to take his advice, but the crowd of the common people was so great that it became impossible for him to alter his course. The same cause compelled him to ride at a slow pace, so that the assassin had time to take a deliberate aim; and as he passed the fatal house, he shot him right through the lower part of the body; the bullet entering above the belt of his doublet, came out near the hucklebone, and killed the horse of Arthur Douglas, who rode close beside him.² The very suddenness and success of this atrocious action produced a horror and confusion which favoured the murderer's escape; and mounting his horse with the weapon of his revenge still warm in his grasp, he was already many miles from the spot, whilst the people, infuriated at the sight of their bleeding governor, were in vain attempting to break open the door of the lodging from which the shot proceeded. A few, however, caught a sight of him as he fled, and giving chase observed that he took the road to Hamilton.³ Here he was received in triumph by the Bishop of St. Andrew's, the Lord Arbroath, of whom Bothwellhaugh was a retainer, and the whole

¹ MS. Letter, St. P. Off. B. C. Hunsdon to Cecil, Berwick, 26 January, 1569-70.

² MS. Letter, St. P. Off. B. C. Hunsdon to Cecil, Berwick, 24 January, 1569-70. Also Id. Same to same, 26 January, 1569-70.

³ MS. Letter, St. P. Off. B.C. Copy endorsed by Hunsdon himself. Hunsdon to Elizabeth, Berwick, 30 January, 1569-70.

faction of the Hamiltons. They instantly assembled in arms, declared Scotland once more free from the thralldom of an ambitious tyrant, who had been cut off at the very moment when he was plotting against the life of his sovereign; and resolved instantly to proceed to Edinburgh to join with Grange, liberate their chief, the Duke of Chastelherault, and follow up the advantage they had won.¹

All these events took place with a startling rapidity, of which the slow progress of written description can convey but a faint idea: in the meantime the unhappy regent, though bleeding profusely, had strength enough to walk to the palace, where at first the surgeons gave hopes of his recovery. Mortal symptoms, however, soon appeared, and when made acquainted with them he received the information with his usual calm demeanour. When his friends bitterly lamented his fate, remarking that he might long since have taken the miscreant's life, and observing that his clemency had been his ruin, Murray mildly answered, that they would never make him repent of any good he had done in his life; and after faintly but affectionately commending the charge of the young prince to such of the nobility as were present, he died tranquilly a little before midnight.²

¹ MS. St. P. Off. Information anent the punishment of the Regent's murder.

² Spottiswood, p. 233.

I will not attempt any laboured character of this extraordinary man, who, coming into the possession of almost uncontrolled power, as the leader of the Reformed party, when he was little more than a youth, was cut off in the midst of his greatness before he was forty years old.¹ Living in those wretched times, when the country was torn by two parties which mortally hated each other, he has come down to us so disfigured by the prejudices of his contemporaries that it is difficult to discern his true features. As to his personal intrepidity, his talents for state affairs, his military capacity, and the general purity of his private life, in a corrupt age and court, there can be no difference of opinion. It has been recorded of him, that he ordered himself and his family in such sort, that it did more resemble a church than a court;² and it is but fair to conclude that this proceeded from his deep feelings of religion, and a steady attachment to a reformation, which he believed to be founded on the word of God. But, on the other hand, there are some facts, especially such as occurred during the latter part of his career, which throw suspicion upon his motives, and weigh heavily against him. He consented to the murder of Riccio; to compass his own return to power, he unscrupulously leagued himself with men whom he knew to be the murderers of the king; used their evidence to convict his sovereign; and refused to turn against them

¹ He was born in 1530, and slain in 1569-70.

² Spottiswood, p. 233.

till they began to threaten his power, and declined to act as the tools of his ambition. If we regard private faith and honour, how can we defend his betrayal of Norfolk, and his consent to deliver up Northumberland ; if we look to love of country, a principle now perhaps too lightly esteemed, but inseparable from all true greatness, what are we to think of his last ignominious offers to Elizabeth ? if we go higher still, and seek for that love which is the only test of religious truth, how difficult is it to think that it could have a place in his heart, whose last transaction went to aggravate the imprisonment, if not to recommend the death, of a miserable princess, his own sister and his sovereign.

All are agreed that he was a noble looking personage, of grave and commanding manners. His funeral, which was a solemn spectacle, took place on the 14th of February, in the High Church of St. Giles, at Edinburgh, where he was buried in St. Anthony's Aisle. The body had been taken from Linlithgow to Stirling, and thence was transported by water to Leith, and carried to the palace of Holyrood. In the public procession to the church it was accompanied by the magistrates and citizens of Edinburgh, who greatly lamented him. They were followed by the gentlemen of the country, and these by the nobility. The Earls of Morton, Mar, Glencairn, and Cassilis, with the Lords Glamis, Lindsay, Ochiltree, and Ruthven, carried the body ; before it came the Lairds of Grange, and Colvil of Cleish ; Grange

bearing his banner, with the royal arms, and Cleish his coat armour. The servants of his household followed, making great lamentation, as Randolph, an eye witness, wrote to Cecil. On entering the church the bier was placed before the pulpit, and Knox preached the sermon, taking for his text, "Blessed are the dead that die in the Lord."¹

¹ MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Randolph to Cecil, Edinburgh, 23 Feb. 1569. *Diurnal of Occurrents*, p. 158.

CHAP. IV.

1570 - 1572.

Interregnum—Regencies of Lennox and Mar.

CONTEMPORARY SOVEREIGNS.

<i>England.</i>	<i>France.</i>	<i>Germany.</i>	<i>Spain.</i>	<i>Portugal.</i>	<i>Pope.</i>
Elizabeth.	Charles IX.	Maximilian II.	Philip II.	Sebastian.	Pius VI.

THE death of Murray was a serious blow to Elizabeth. Its consequences threatened to unite closely the party which favoured the restoration of Mary, and were solicitous for a general pacification. The Hamiltons, Lethington, Herries, Huntly, and Argyle had vigorously resisted the measures of the regent, and felt impatient under the ascendancy of English influence, which Murray, Morton, and their faction had introduced. That “inestimable commodity,”¹ an English party in Scotland, which Elizabeth’s ministers described as having been so difficult to attain, and so invaluable in its effects, was now threatened with destruction; and Lord Hunsdon, the very day after Murray’s death, wrote in anxious terms, requiring the queen’s immediate

¹ Anderson’s Collections, vol. iv., P. i., p. 104.

attention to the state of Scotland. Important matters, he said, depended and would fall out by this event, and much vigilance would be required to watch "the great faction which remained, who were all French."¹

Nor were these apprehensions exaggerated. If Elizabeth looked to her own realm, it was full of discontented subjects, and on the very eve of another rebellion. If to Scotland, Mary's adherents were in a state of high elatedness and hope;² the Hamiltons had already taken arms, the castles of Edinburgh and Dumbarton were in the hands of her friends, succours had arrived in the Clyde from France, and on the morning after the regent's death, Scott of Buccleugh, and Car of Farnyhurst, two of the mightiest of the border chiefs, broke into England, and in a destructive "raid," let loose their vengeance. In their company was Nevil, the banished Earl of Westmoreland, a rough soldier and devoted friend of Mary, who, as Hunsdon wrote Cecil, had testified his joy on hearing of Murray's death, by casting his hat into the fire, replacing it no doubt by a steel bonnet.

All this was ground for much anxiety at home, and the prospect was not more encouraging abroad. In France the news of Murray's assassination pro-

¹ MS. Letter, St. P. Off. B.C. Hunsdon to Cecil, Jan. 24, 1569-70. An imperfect Letter.

² MS. Letter, St. P. Off. B. C. Hunsdon to Cecil, Berwick, Jan. 30, 1569-70. Also Id. Information anent the punishment of the Regent's murder.

duced a paroxysm of joy, and was followed by active preparations to follow up the advantage.¹ In Spain no less interest was felt, and at that moment Douglas, a messenger from the Duke of Alva, employed by the Bishop of Ross, was in Scotland. He had brought letters to the friends of Mary, sewed under the buttons of his coat, had twice supplied them with money, and warmly exhorted them to keep up the contest until assistance arrived from Philip.²

These were all alarming indications, and the papers of Elizabeth's vigilant and indefatigable minister Cecil, contain ample proof that he was not insensible to the importance of the crisis. In an able but somewhat Macchiavelian memorial on the state of the realm, drawn up on the very eve of Murray's murder, and the arguments in which were greatly strengthened by that event,³ he stated the perils both in respect of persons and matters to be many, great, and imminent, pointed out the increasing strength of the Romish party all over Europe, the decay and probable extinction of the Protestant power in France and Flanders, the weakening of all those counter forces which his mistress had hitherto been successful in raising against it, and the well known resolution of the court of Rome, and the three great powers of Spain, Austria, and

¹ MS. Letter, St. P. Off. French Cor. Norris to Cecil, Feb. 17, 1569, Angiers. Id. Norris to Cecil, Feb. 25, 1569.

² MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Hunsdon to Cecil, Jan. 26, 1569-70.

³ Haynes, p. 579.

France, never to intermit their efforts until they had destroyed England, and placed its crown upon the head of the Scottish Queen. In the same paper he called her attention to that unceasing encouragement to intrigue and rebellion, which was held out by Mary's presence in England, and the growing unanimity and power of her party at home.

All this, it was evident, called for immediate exertion, and, in Cecil's opinion, there was but one way to provide a remedy, or at least to arrest the evil in its progress. Scotland was the field on which Elizabeth's domestic and foreign enemies were uniting against her. The strength of that country lay in the union of its various factions, which previous to Murray's death had been nearly accomplished by the efforts of Lethington and Grange, and which this event threatened to accelerate. Her policy, then, must be, to prevent a pacification, keep up an English party, and find her own peace in the dissensions and misery of her neighbour. For this end two instruments were necessary, and must instantly be procured—the first an ambassador, who, under the mask of a peacemaker, might sow the seeds of disquiet and confusion: the second a regent, who would submit to her dictation. She found the one in Sir Thomas Randolph, an accomplished master in political intrigue, whom she dispatched to Scotland only three days after the death of Murray.¹ For the second,

¹ MS. Letter, Draft, St. P. Off., entirely in Cecil's hand. Minute of the Queen's Majesty's letter, Jan. 29, 1569. Melvil's

she chose the Earl of Lennox, father of the unhappy Darnley, who had long been a pensioner upon her bounty, and whose moderate abilities and pliant disposition promised the subserviency which she wished.

Immediately after the regent's death, this nobleman had addressed a "supplication to Elizabeth representing the great danger in which it left the infant king, his grandson, her majesty's near kinsman, and suggesting the propriety of extending her protection to the "little innocent," by getting him delivered into her own hands.¹ This had been always a favourite project of the queen's, and disposed her to think favourably of Lennox, but another cause recommended him still more strongly. There had long existed a deadly hatred between the two great houses of Hamilton and Lennox, and no more effectual method to kindle a flame in Scotland could have been adopted, than the elevation of this nobleman to the first rank in the government.²

In the meantime Elizabeth received a letter from Lord Hunsdon, the governor of Berwick, which in some degree quieted her apprehensions, and gave her better hopes than he had at first held out. A week after the regent's murder, the Earl of

Memoirs, p. 227. Also 230, 231. "He" (Randolph) says this author, "was deliberately directed secretly to kindle a fire of discord between the twa stark factions in Scotland, quhilk could not be easily quenched."

¹ Haynes, p. 576.

² Melvil's *Memoirs*, p. 227.

Morton requested a meeting at Edinburgh with Sir Henry Gates and Sir William Drury, who had come to Scotland on a mission to the regent, and were in that country when he died. It was held in Gates's lodging, and there besides Morton, the envoy met Grange, Lindsay, Sir James Balfour, Makgill, the justice clerk, Bellenden the clerk register, with the lairds of Pitarrow and Tullibardin.

The conference was opened by Makgill, who assured the English envoys of their continued devotion to Elizabeth, and betrayed an evident terror lest she should set their queen at liberty and send her home amongst them. They spoke of an approaching convention of the nobility, but declared that if the queen of England would accept their services, secure their religion, and aid them to resist the intrusion of foreigners, they would run with her the same course which Murray had done, and decide on nothing till they knew her pleasure—as to a regent, her majesty would do well, they said, to think of the Earl of Lennox, a Stewart by birth, a Douglas by marriage, and at that time within her majesty's realm. If she would send him, they were ready to make him the head of their faction, and should she wish him to be accompanied by any confidential person whose advice he might use, they would gladly receive him also. In the concluding passage of Hunsdon's letter to the queen, he entreated her when such "good stuff was offered," not to hesitate about its acceptance—adding, that if the Hamiltons were allowed

to bear the chief sway, the French would not be long absent. Lastly, he implored her to watch the Bishop of Ross, and take good heed to the Scottish Queen.¹

Randolph soon after arrived in the capital, and notwithstanding the encouraging assurances of Morton and his friends, found things in an unsettled state.² Yet this was far from ungratifying to a minister who considered that the strength of his royal mistress lay in the dissensions of her neighbours. A messenger had been sent from Argyle and the Hamiltons, who warned their opponents not to acknowledge any other authority than the queen's, declaring that as her lieutenants in Scotland,³ they were ready to punish the regent's murder, but ridiculing the idea that the whole race of Hamilton were guilty because the murderer bore their name. To this the reply was a public proclamation interdicting any one from holding communication with that faction, under the penalty of being esteemed accomplices in their crimes. Soon after Lethington, who till now had remained in a nominal captivity in the castle, was summoned at his own request, before

¹ MS. Letter, a copy by Hunsdon himself. St. P. Off. 30 Jan. 1569-70. Hunsdon to Elizabeth.

² He arrived on the 9th February, 1569-70.

³ Diurnal of Occurrents, p. 157. MS. Letter, St. P. Office, Edinburgh, 22 Feb. 1569. Randolph to Cecil. Also MS. St. P. Off. copy, Proclamation by the Lords of the Secret Council, Feb. 1569.

the privy council, where he pleaded his innocence of the king's murder, complained of the grievous calumnies with which his name had been loaded, and professed his readiness to stand his trial, and reply to any who dared accuse him. This, as it was well known, no one was prepared to do—and the council immediately pronounced him guiltless, reinstating him in his accustomed place and office “as a profitable member of the commonwealth,” and one who had been an excellent instrument in the “forth-setting of God's glory.”¹ Of his accession to the murder there is not the slightest doubt, and as little of Morton's guilt, who on this occasion, took the lead as chancellor of the kingdom. The whole transaction was an idle farce, and deceived no one, but the party required Lethington's able head, and imagined they could thus secure his assistance.

At this meeting Randolph communicated his instructions, and assured the council of his royal mistress's support, on condition that they would remain true to the principles of the late regent. For her part, he said, she would increase the rigour of Mary's confinement, and support them both with money and soldiers; from them she expected that they would watch over the young king, prevent his being carried to France, maintain religion, preserve peace, and deliver up the rebel Earls of

¹ Diurnal of Occurrents, p. 158. MS. St. P. Off. Copy. Endorsed by Randolph. Declaration of the Lord of Liddington's innocence of the king's murder.

Northumberland and Westmoreland.¹ A convention of the whole nobility of the realm was summoned for the 4th of March, to take these offers into consideration, and proceed to the election of a regent.² Letters were written to Lennox, requesting his immediate presence, and Randolph, with an evident alacrity, recommenced his intrigues with all parties.

In the midst of this, a new rebellion broke out in the North of England. It was led by Leonard Dacres, a Roman Catholic gentleman, of noble family,³ bred up in the bosom of border war, who had been associated in the enterprises of Westmoreland and Northumberland, but was kept back by his friends at that time from any open demonstration. When still brooding over his projects, the law adjudged the rich family estates, of which he deemed himself the heir, to the daughters of his elder brother, and stung with this imagined injury, he at once broke into rebellion, seized the castles of Naworth, Greystock, and other places of strength, collected three thousand men, and bid defiance to the government. It was an alarming outbreak, and greatly disturbed Elizabeth; but the flame was extinguished almost as soon as kindled, for Lord Hunsdon instantly advanced from Berwick with

¹ MS. Draft, St. P. Off. in Cecil's hand. Minute of the Queen's Majesty's Instructions given to Mr. Randolph.

² MS. St. P. Off. Endorsed by Randolph. Letters sent by the Lords for the Assembly, 17 February, 1569-70.

³ Second son of Lord Dacres of Gillesland.

the best soldiers of his garrison there, and Sir John Forster, warden of the middle marches, meeting him with the border militia, they encountered the fierce insurgent on the banks of the little river Gelt, in Cumberland, and after a sanguinary battle, entirely defeated him. Dacres and his brother fled into Scotland, where his presence along with Westmoreland and Northumberland, formed a just subject of complaint and jealousy to the English Queen.¹

Scotland in the mean time presented a melancholy spectacle, torn between two factions, one professing allegiance to the captive queen, the other supporting the king's authority, both pretending an equal desire for the peace of their country, but thwarted in every effort to accomplish it by their own ambition and the intrigues of England. Of these two parties, the friends of the captive queen were the strongest, and must soon have triumphed over their opponents, but for the assistance given their opponents by Elizabeth. They included the highest and most ancient nobility in the country. The Duke of Chastelherault and the whole power of the Hamiltons, the Earls of Argile, Huntly, Athol, Errol, Crawford, and Marshall, Caithness, Cassillis, Sutherland, and Eglinton, the Lords Hume, Seaton, Ogilvy, Ross, Borthwick, Oliphant, Yester, and Fleming, Herries, Boyd, Somerville,

¹ MS. Letter, B. C. St. P. Off. Hunsdon to the Queen, 20 Feb. 1569-70. Also MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Same to same, 27 Feb. 1569, Lingard, vol. viii. p. 60.

Innermeath, Forbes, and Gray.¹ The mere enumeration of these names shows the power of that great party in the state which now anxiously desired the restoration of the queen, and resisted the hostile dictation, whilst they still intreated the good offices, of Elizabeth. They possessed the castles of Edinburgh and Dumbarton, the first commanding the capital of the country, the second its strongest fortress, and from its situation on the Clyde, affording a port by which foreign succours could be easily introduced into Scotland. But their chief strength lay in Kirkaldy of Grange, and Maitland of Lethington, the secretary; Grange being universally reputed the bravest and most fortunate soldier, and Maitland the ablest statesman in the country.

It was generally believed, that with two such heads to direct them Mary's party would be more than a match for their opponents. Yet these were formidable enough. Their great leader, and the soul of every measure, was the Earl of Morton, a man bred up from his infancy in the midst of civil commotion, "nusselled in war and shedding of blood," (to use a strong phrase of Cecil's)² and so intensely selfish and ambitious, that country, kindred, or religion, were readily trampled on in

¹ MS. St. P. Off. Petition to Elizabeth, end of March, 1570. Endorsed by Cecil, Duke of Chastelherault, and his Associates, to the Queen's Majesty.

² Haynes's State Papers, p. 581. The phrase is applied by Cecil to the Duke of Anjou.

his struggle for power. His interest had made him a steady Protestant. By his professions of attachment to the Reformation, he gained the powerful support of Knox and the Church, and he was completely devoted to England. His associates were Lennox, Mar, the governor of the infant king, Glencairn, and Buchan, with the Lords Glamis, Ruthven, Lindsay, Cathcart, Methven, Ochiltree, and Saltoun.¹

Such was the state and strength of the two parties when Randolph returned to Scotland as ambassador from Elizabeth, and, acting under the directions of Cecil, exerted himself with such success, to increase their mutual asperity, that every attempt at union or conciliation proved unsuccessful. The miserable condition of the country, at this moment, has been strikingly described by Sir James Melvil, an eye-witness, and an old acquaintance of Randolph. "Now," says he, "the two furious factions being framed in this manner, the hatred and rage against each other grew daily greater. For Master Randolph knew the diversities that were among the noblemen, and the nature of every one in particular by his oft-coming and long residence in Scotland. Among the ladies he had a mother, and a mistress, to whom he caused his queen oft send communications and tokens. He used also his craft with the ministers,² and

¹ MS. Copy of the time. St. P. Off. Instructions given by the Lords of Scotland to the Commendator of Dumfermling, 1st May, 1570.

² The Clergy.

offered gold to divers of them. One of them that ~~was very honest~~, refused his gift, but he told that his companion took it as by way of charity. I am not certain if any of the rest took presents, but undoubtedly he offered to such as were in meetest rowmes,¹ to cry out against factions here and there, and kindle the fiercer fire, so that the parties were not content to fight and shed each other's blood, but would flyte² with injurious and blasphemous words, and at length fell to the down-casting of each other's houses, whereunto England lent their help." * * * "Then, as Nero stood up upon a high part of Rome, to see the town burning which he had caused set on fire, so Master Randolph delighted to see such fire kindled in Scotland, and by his writings to some in the Court of England, glorified himself to have brought it to pass in such sort, that it should not be got easily slokenit³ again, which, when it came to the knowledge of Sir Nicholas Throkmorton, he wrote in⁴ Scotland to my brother and me, and advertised us how we were handled, detesting both Master Cecil as director, and Master Randolph as executor."⁵

In such a state of things repeated attempts were made to hold that Convention of the nobility, which had been appointed to meet early in March; but all proved ineffectual, and Argile, in a conference with Morton and Lethington at

¹ Offices.

² Scold.

³ Extinguished with water.

⁴ Into.

⁵ Melvil's Memoirs, pp. 233, 234.

Dalkeith, bitterly reproached Randolph as the chief cause of their miseries. He appears to have taken the attack with great composure, and contented himself with writing a humorous satirical letter to Cecil, in which he amused the English secretary with a portrait of his Scottish brother: "The Lord of Lethington," said he, "is presently at Seaton to air himself before this convention. His wits are sharp enough, and his will good enough to do good, but fearful and doubtful to take matters in hand. He doubteth some thunder-clap out of the south, (an allusion to Lennox's threatened coming), for he hath spied a cloud somewhat afar off, which, if it fall in this country, wrecketh both him and all his family. * * * I doubt nothing so much of him as I do of the length of his life. He hath only his heart whole, and his stomach good, [with] an honest mind, somewhat more given to policy than to Mr. Knox's preachings. His legs are clean gone, his body so weak that it sustaineth not itself, his inward parts so feeble, that to endure to sneeze he cannot, for annoying the whole body. To this the blessed joy of a young wife hath brought him."

On the day this letter was written, the populace of Edinburgh, by whom the late regent had been much beloved, were highly excited by the display, in the open street, of a black banner on which he was painted lying dead in his bed, with

¹ MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Randolph to Cecil, 1st March, 1569

his wound open ; beside him the late king under the tree, as he was found in the garden of the Kirk of Field, and at his feet the little prince, kneeling and imploring God to avenge his cause. Many poems and ballads, describing Murray's assassination, and exhorting to revenge, were scattered amongst the people, and the exasperation of the two parties became daily more incurable.¹

The failure of the great assembly appointed for March, was followed by busy preparations. Every baron assembled his vassals, armed conventions of the king's and queen's lords, as the two rival factions were now termed, were held in various quarters, and Morton and Mar, who had been encouraged by the message from Elizabeth,² having assembled their friends in great strength in the capital, were eagerly pressing for the return of Lennox, when the arrival of Monsieur Verac from the court of France gave a sudden check to their hopes.³ He brought letters of encouragement and ample promises of succour to Mary's friends, and as they had received similar assurances from Spain, they concentrated their whole strength, advanced to Edinburgh, consulted with Grange, the governor of the castle, restored the Duke of

¹ St. P. Off. Printed Broad sides, in black letter, by Lekprivick.

² MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Mar to the Queen of England, Edinburgh, 14th March, 1569.

³ Copy of the time, St. P. Off. Lethington to Leicester, 29th March, 1570. Also MS. Letter, St. P. Off. John Gordon to Elizabeth, Berwick, 18th April, 1570.

Chastelherault and Lord Herries to liberty,¹ compelled Randolph to fly from the scene of his intrigues to Berwick, and summoned a general convention of the whole nobility at Linlithgow. Its declared object was to return an answer to France, and deliberate upon the best means of restoring peace to their unhappy country: at the same time they addressed a petition to Elizabeth, in which they earnestly implored her to put an end to the miserable divisions of Scotland by restoring the Scottish Queen.²

Very different thoughts, however, from peace or restoration were then agitating the English Queen. The intrigues of Norfolk, the successive northern rebellions, the flight of the disaffected into Scotland, the invasion of Buccleugh and Farny-hirst, the fact that this "Raid" had been especially cruel, and that its leaders had shown a foreknowledge of Murray's death, besides the perpetual alarm in which she was kept by the dread of French intervention and Spanish intrigue, had roused her passion to so high a pitch, that she commanded Sussex, her lieutenant in the north, to advance into Scotland at the head of 7,000 men. The pretext was, to seize her rebels, the real design was, to let loose her vengeance upon the friends of Mary, to destroy the country by fire

¹ Diurnal of Occurrents, p. 167.

² MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Duke of Chastelherault and his Associates to the Queen's Majesty, 31st March, 1570, dispatched from Edinburgh, 16th April.

and sword, and to incite the different factions to actual hostilities.¹

On being informed of this resolution, the queen's lords exerted their utmost efforts to prevent the advance of a force which they were wholly unprepared to resist.² In England the Bishop of Ross and the French ambassador warmly remonstrated with the queen; Lethington, too, assured Leicester that a demonstration of hostilities would infallibly compel them to combine against her, and three several envoys successively sought the camp of Sussex to deprecate his advance. But Elizabeth was much excited; Randolph, at this moment, had warned her of a conspiracy against her life, and hinted that Mary was at the bottom of it,³ whilst Morton blew the flame by accounts of the hostile activity of Lethington, the total desertion of Grange, and the warlike preparations of their opponents.

No one that knew the English Queen expected that she would have the magnanimity or the humanity to arrest her arms. Under such provocation the storm burst with terrific force. Sussex, entering the beautiful district of Teviot-

¹ MS. Letter, Draft by Cecil. St. P. Off. To Mr. Randolph, 18th March, 1569-70. Melvil's Memoirs, p. 227.

² Copy of the time, endorsed by Cecil. St. P. Off. Instructions for the Laird of Trabroun, 15th April, 1570. Also MS. Letter, St. P. Off. 18th April, 1570. John Gordon to the Queen's Majesty.

³ MS. Letter, St. P. Off. 14th April, 1570. Randolph to Cecil.

dale and the Merse, the country of Buccleugh and Farnyhurst, destroyed at once fifty castles or houses of strength, and three hundred villages.¹ In a second inroad, Home Castle, one of the strongest in the country, was invested and taken; about the same time the western border was invaded by Lord Scrope, a country particularly obnoxious as the seat of Herries and Maxwell, and the track of the English army was marked by the flames of villages and granges, and the utter destruction of the labours of the husbandman.² To follow up this severity, Elizabeth dispatched Lennox, her intended regent, and Sir William Drury, the Marshal of Berwick, at the head of twelve hundred foot and four hundred horse. This little army included the veteran companies, called the old bands of Berwick,³ and had orders to advance to the capital, and avenge the death of the Regent upon the house of Hamilton.

To Lennox no more grateful commission could be entrusted, and making all allowance for the recollection of ancient injuries it is difficult to regard the intensity of his vengeance without disgust. His letters addressed to Elizabeth and Cecil are unfavourable specimens of his character—full of abject expressions of implicit submission, unworthy of his country and his high rank.⁴ He appears to

¹ Murdin, p. 769. Lesly's Negotiations, Anderson, vol. iii. p. 90.

² Spottiswood, p. 237.

³ Diurnal of Occurrents, p. 176.

⁴ MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Lennox to Cecil, 16th April, 1570. Same to same, 27th April, 1570. Same to same, 8th May, 1570.

have been wretchedly poor, entirely dependent for his supplies upon the bounty of the English Queen, and although on his march a grievous sickness had brought him to the brink of the grave, his first thoughts on returning health were, as he boasted to Cecil, "that he should soon pull the feathers out of the wings of his opponents."¹ This he and his colleague, the Marshall of Berwick, performed very effectually, for having advanced to Edinburgh, and formed a junction with Morton and his friends, they dispersed the queen's faction who were besieging the castle of Glasgow, and commenced a pitiless devastation of Clydesdale and Linlithgowshire, rasing their castles, destroying their villages, and making a desert of the whole territory. In this expedition the palace of Hamilton, belonging to the Duke of Chastelherault, with his castles of Linlithgow and Kinneil, and the estates and houses of his kindred and partizans were so completely sacked and cast down, that this noble and powerful house was reduced to the very brink of ruin.²

Having achieved this, Lennox wrote in an elated tone to Cecil glorying in the flight of their enemies, recommending the English to reduce Dumbarton, and imploring Elizabeth to pity his poverty and send him more money.³ From Lethington the

¹ MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Lennox to Cecil, 27th April, 1570.

Ibid. Same to same, 8th May, 1570.

² Diurnal of Occurrents, p. 177. Murdin, p. 769.

³ MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Lennox to Cecil 18th May, 1570. Edin. MS. Letter, Ibid. The Lords to Sussex 16th May, 1570, Edin.

English minister received a letter in a different and more manly strain. "It was his astonishment," he said, "and a mystery to him, that the Queen of England had renounced the amity of a powerful party in Scotland, consisting of the best and noblest in the realm, for the friendship of a few, utterly inferior to them in degree, and whose strength he might judge of by their being only able to muster two hundred horse. In their mad attempts they had thought nothing less than that they might have carried off the ball alone, and have haled the devil without impediment, but he had thrown a stumbling-block in their way, and although they would fain make him odious in England, he trusted Leicester and Cecil would give as little heed to their aspersions as he did to their threats. Meanwhile he was still ready to unite with them in all good offices, and whatever happened would not be Lot's wife. As for Randolph, he feared, he had been but an evil instrument, and would never believe the queen could have followed the course she now adopted, if truly informed of the state of Scotland."¹

These remonstrances of Lethington were repeated and enforced in England by the French Ambassador and the Bishop of Ross, and Elizabeth began to have misgivings that her severity would unite the whole country against her. She instantly wrote to Sussex, described her interview with the French am-

¹ Copy, St. P. Off. Lethington to Cecil, 17th May, 1570. I have ventured to state the letter from internal evidence to be addressed to Cecil. It is a copy and does not bear any superscription.

bassador, declared she had justified the expedition as well as she could, by asserting that she was only pursuing her rebels, but that she was sorry he had taken so decided a part, and would not hear of his besieging Dumbarton.¹ At the same time she commanded Randolph to return from Berwick to Edinburgh, and inform the two factions that having “reasonably” chastised her rebels, she had yielded to the desire of Mary’s ambassador, the Bishop of Ross, and was about to open a negotiation for her restoration to her dominions. In the meanwhile Sussex was directed to correspond with Morton and his party. Ross repaired to Chatsworth to deliberate with his royal mistress, and her offers for an accommodation were carried into Scotland by Lord Livingston and John Beaton. The English army then retired, and Elizabeth assured both factions of her earnest desire for the common tranquillity.²

These transactions occupied a month, and led to no pacific result, a matter of little surprise to those who were assured of the hollowness of the professions on the side of the English Queen and Morton. The one had not the slightest intention of restoring Mary; the other deprecated such an event as absolute ruin; and having humbled his enemies, looked forward to a rich harvest of forfeiture and plunder.

¹ MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Minute by Cecil of the Queen’s Letter to Sussex, May 22nd, 1570,

² MS. St. P. Off. Draft by Cecil. Queen to the Lords of Scotland, May 31st, 1570.

A correspondence between Sussex, the leader of the late cruel invasions, and Lethington was the only remarkable feature in the negotiations. The English earl had been a commissioner in the conferences at York ; he was familiar with the services of Murray, Lethington, and Morton, during their days of fellowship, and was selected by Elizabeth to remonstrate with Maitland on his desertion of his old friends. To his letters the secretary replied by some bitter remarks on his recent cruelties, and he exposed also the infamous conduct of the king's faction to their queen and their native country. Sussex answered, that he would be glad to know how Lethington reconciled his doings at York, when he came forward and accused his sovereign of murder, with this new zeal in her defence. " Your lordship," said he, addressing the Scottish secretary, " must call to remembrance that your queen was by you and others, then of the faction of Scotland, and not by the queen my sovereign, nor by her knowledge or assent, brought to captivity, deprived of her royal estate, to which she was by God's ordinance born lawful inheretrix, condemned in parliament, her son crowned as lawful king, the late Earl of Murray appointed by parliament to be regent, and revoked from beyond the seas ; yourself held the place of secretary to that king and state ; and after she escaped from her captivity, from the which the queen my sovereign had by all good means sought to deliver her, and had been the only means to save her life while she con-

tinued there, yourself and your faction at that time came into England, to detect her of a number of heinous crimes, by you objected against her, to offer your proofs, which to the uttermost you produced, to seek to have her delivered into your own hands, or to bind the queen's majesty to detain her in such sort, as she should never return into Scotland, and to persuade her majesty to maintain the king's authority. Now, my Lord, to return to my former questions, which be but branches from those roots and cannot be severed from them, I do desire to know by what doctrine, you may think that cause to be then just, which you now think to be unjust? [how] you may think your coming into England, your detecting her of crimes, by you objected, your proofs produced for that purpose, your requests delivered to the queen my sovereign, to deliver her into your custody, or to promise to keep her as she return not to Scotland; and to maintain her son's authority, (then allowed always by you to be your lawful king) by what doctrine I say, may ye think the causes hereof to be then just, which you now think to be unjust?

“ I would be glad to admit your excuse, that you were not *of* the number that sought rigour to your queen, although you were *with* the number, if I could do it with a safe conscience. But as I will say, ‘ Non est meum accusare, aliud ago,’ and therefore I will not enter into those particularities, so can I not make myself ignorant of what I saw openly delivered by word and writing, with a gene-

ral assent of the late regent ; and all that were in his company, which tended not to a short restraint of your queen's liberty, but was directly either to deliver her captive unto your own custody, or to bind the queen my sovereign to detain her in such sort as she should never after trouble the state of Scotland ; wherein, if her perpetual captivity or a worse matter were meant, and not a restraint for a time, God and your own consciences, and others that dealt then with you do know. It may be you dealt openly on the one side and secretly on the other, wherein, how the queen my sovereign digested your doings I know not ; but this I know well, that if her majesty would have digested that which was openly delivered unto her by the general assent of your whole company, in such sort as you all desired, devised, and earnestly (I will not say passionately) persuaded her at that time to do for her own surety, the benefit of Scotland, and the continuing of the amity between both the realms ; there had been worse done to your queen, than either her majesty or any subject of England that I know, whomsoever you take to be least free from passions, could be induced to think meet to be done."¹

This cutting personal appeal, from one so intimately acquainted with the secrets of these dark transactions, was evaded by Lethington, under the plea that if he went into an exculpation, it must

¹ MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Sussex to Ledington, 29 July, 1570.

needs “touch more than himself,” glancing probably at his royal mistress; but Sussex in a former letter having assumed to himself some credit for revoking the army, the Scottish secretary observed, that they no doubt would need some repose after their exertions, and ironically complimented him for his activity in the pursuit of his mistress’s rebels.

“When your lordship,” said he, “writeth, that you intend to revoke her majesty’s forces, I am glad thereof more than I was at their coming in; and it is not amiss for their ease to have a breathing time, and some rest between one exploit and another. This is the third journey they have made in Scotland, since your lordship came to the borders, and [you] have been so well occupied in every one of them, that it might well be said, * * they have reasonable well acquitted themselves of the duty of old enemies, and have burnt and spoiled as much ground within Scotland as any army of England did in one year, these hundred years by past, which may suffice for a two months work, although you do no more.”¹

At the same time, Randolph in a letter from Berwick, to his old military friend Grange, bantered him on his acceptance of the priory of St. Andrew’s, a rich gift, with which it was reported Mary had secured his services. “Brother William,” said he, “it was indeed most wonderful unto me, when I heard that you should

¹ Copy of the time, St. P. Off. Ledington to Sussex, 2 June, 1570, Dunkeld.

become a Prior. That vocation agreeth not with any thing that ever I knew in you, saving for your religious life led under the cardinal's hat, when we were both students in Paris."¹

It would have been well if these little attacks and bickerings, which I have given as illustrating the character of some of the leading actors in the times, had been the only weapons resorted to during this pretended cessation of hostilities, but such was far from being the case. On the contrary, the country presented a miserable spectacle of intestine commotion and private war, and it was in vain that all good men sighed and struggled for the restoration of order and tranquillity; the king's authority was despised, the queen remained a captive, there was no regent to whom the poor could look for protection, every petty baron, even every private citizen, found himself compelled to follow a leader, and under the cessation of agriculture and national industry, the nation was rapidly sinking into a state of pitiable weakness and bankruptcy. In the meantime, the Bishop of Ross and the Lord of Livingston, continued their negotiations for Mary;² Cecil and the privy council deliberated, and the poor captive, languishing under her lengthened imprisonment, refused no concession which she deemed consistent

¹ Copy of the time, St. P. Off. May 1, 1570. Thomas Randolph to the Laird of Grange.

² MS. St. P. Off. B. C. Minute of the Queen's Letter to Sussex. A Draft by Cecil, July 29, 1570. Lesly's Negotiations, Anderson, vol. iii., p. 91.

with her honour; but every effort failed, from the exasperation of the two factions.

Morton and Lennox had despatched the Abbot of Dumfermling, to carry their offers to Elizabeth, and were thrown into deep anxiety by her doubtful replies.¹ She had stimulated them to take arms, and now, as they had experienced on former occasions, she appeared ready to abandon them, when to advance without her aid was impossible, and to recede would be absolute ruin.

In this difficulty, a decided step was necessary, and they determined to raise Lennox to the regency. It was a measure imperatively required, as the only means of giving union and vigour to their party, and as they acted with the advice of Randolph the English ambassador, they were well assured, that although Elizabeth affected neutrality for the moment, such a step would not be unacceptable to her. But in deference to her wishes for delay, they proceeded with caution. In a convention of the lords of the king's faction, held at Stirling on the 16th of June, they conferred upon Lennox the *interim* office of Lieutenant-governor under the king, until the 12th of July. This choice they immediately imparted to the Eng-

¹ Copy of the time, St. P. Off. Instructions of the Lords of Scotland, to the Abbot of Dumfermling, May 1, 1570. Also Copy, St. P. Off. The Lords of Scotland to the Queen's Majesty, June 1, 1570. Edin. By the Abbot of Dumfermling. Also MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Morton and the Lords to the English Privy Council, June 24, 1570.

lish queen, and earnestly entreated her advice as to the appointment of a Regent.¹ Her reply was favourable ; the disorders of the country now called loudly, she said, for some settled government, and whilst she disclaimed all idea of dictation, and should be satisfied with their choice wherever it fell, it appeared to her that her cousin the Earl of Lennox, whom they had already nominated their lieutenant, was likely to be more careful of the safety of the young king than any other.² Thus encouraged, a convention was held at Edinburgh on the 12th of July, in which Lennox was formally elected Regent. Lethington was then in Athol. Huntly, whom Mary had invested with the office of her lieutenant-governor,³ remained at Aberdeen, concentrating the strength of the North, and the other lords who supported the queen's authority were busily employed arming their vassals in their various districts. Of course none of these appeared at the convention ; and Grange, who com-

¹ MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Morton and the Lords to the Privy Council, June 24, 1570. The names show the truth of Lethington's observations, as to the weakness of the king's party both in the ancient nobility, and in numbers in comparison with the queen's. They are — Earls Lennox, Morton, Mar, Glencairn, Angus : Lords Glamis, Lindsay, Ruthven, Ochiltree, Borthwick, Cathcart, and Graham the Master of Montrose. Of the Clergy, Robert (Pitcairn), Abbot of Dumfermling, and Robert, Bishop of Caithness.

² Spottiswood, p. 241.

³ MS. Letter, St. P. Off. B. C. Sussex to Cecil, July 15, 1570, Alnwick.

manded in the castle, and might have battered the Tolbooth, where the election took place, about the ears of the new governor, treated the whole proceedings with the utmost contempt. He refused to be present, would not even hear the letter of Elizabeth read by Randolph, and issued orders that no cannon should be fired after the proclamation.¹ Upon this Sussex told Cecil, that he had written "roundly" to him, but so little impression was made by his remonstrances, that the queen's lords declared their determination to hold a parliament at Linlithgow, on the 4th of August, and publicly avowed their resolution never to acknowledge Lennox as Regent.²

Both parties now prepared for war, and the new governor, aware that his only chance of success rested on the support of England, dispatched Nicholas Elphinston to urge the immediate advance of Sussex with his army, and the absolute necessity of having supplies both of money and troops. Without a thousand footmen, it would be impossible for him to make head, he said, against the enemy. Huntly was moving forward to Brechin with all his force, the Hamiltons were mustering in the West, Argyle and his highlanders and islemen, were ready to break down on the lowlands, and at the moment he wrote, Lord Herries and the Lairds of Lochinvar,

¹ Copy of the time, St. P. Off. B. C. Sussex to Cecil, July 19, 1570. Alnwick.

² Copy of the time, St. P. Off. Instructions by Lennox to Nicholas Elphinston, July 23, 1570.

Buccleugh, Farnyhurst, and Johnston, were up in arms and had begun their havoc.¹ These representations alarmed Elizabeth. It was her policy that the two factions should exhaust each other, but that neither should be overwhelmed, and with this view she directed Sussex to ravage the West borders "very secretly," and under the cloak of chastising her rebels the Dacres, who were harboured in these quarters.² At the same time that she thus herself kept up the war, she publicly upbraided both parties with the ceaseless rancour of their hostilities, and with much apparent anxiety encouraged Lord Livingston and the Bishop of Ross, in negotiating a treaty for Mary's restoration.

But whilst nothing but professions of peace and benevolence were on her lips, Scotland was doomed to feel the consequences of such cruel and ungenerous policy in a civil war of unexampled exasperation and atrocity. To prevent any parliament being convened by the queen's lords at Linlithgow, Lennox assembled his forces, with which he joined the Earl of Morton, and advancing against Huntly, stormed the castle of Brechin, and hung up thirty-four of the garrison

¹ MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Lennox to Randolph, Stirling, July 31, 1570. Ibid. Instructions to Nicholas Elphinston, July 23, 1570.

² Draft by Cecil, St. P. Off. July 26, 1570. Queen's Majesty to Sussex.

(officers and soldiers) before his own house.¹ These exploits were communicated by Randolph to Sussex, now busy with his preparations for his expedition against the west, and he informed him at the same time, that in the negotiations then proceeding in England, the Scottish Queen had, it was said, behaved with uncommon spirit. Elizabeth, before she restored her to liberty, having insisted on being put in possession of the castles of Edinburgh and Dumbarton, Mary, on the first mention of such conditions by the Bishop of Ross, indignantly declared, that the matter needed not an instant's consideration. Elizabeth might do to her what she pleased, but never should it be said, that she had brought into bondage that realm of which she was the natural princess.²

Sussex at the head of four thousand men, now burst into Annandale, and advanced in his desolating progress to Dumfries. His own letter to the queen of England, the mediatrix between the two countries will best describe the nature of his visit. "I repaired," said he, "with part of your majesty's forces to Carlisle, and receiving no such answer from the Lord Herries as I expected. * * * I entered Scotland the 22d of this present, and returned thither the 28th, in which time I threw down the castles of Annand and Hoddum,

¹ Copy of the time, St. P. Off. B. C. Randolph to Sussex, 14th August, 1570.

² Copy of the time, St. P. Off. B. C. Randolph to Sussex, 14th August, 1570.

belonging to the Lord Herries, the castles of Dumfries and Carleverock, belonging to the Lord Maxwell, the castles of Tynehill and Cowhill, belonging to the lairds of Tynehill and Cowhill, the castles of Arthur Greame and Richies George Greame, ill neighbours to England and of Englishmen sworn, now Scots, and some other piles where the rebels have been maintained".¹ He observed, in a separate letter to Cecil, "That he had avoided as much as he might the burning of houses or corn, and the taking or spoiling of cattle or goods, to make the revenge appear to be for honour only," and yet, he complacently adds, as if afraid lest his royal mistress should misunderstand his leniency, "I have not left a stone house to an ill neighbour within twenty miles of this town."² It is difficult to recount these transactions of Sussex, without expressing abhorrence of the cruel and nefarious policy by which they were dictated.

This invasion was followed by an abstinence of two months, during which the negotiations for Mary's restoration were continued, but after repeated and protracted deliberations between the commissioners of Elizabeth, the Scottish Queen and the Regent, the issue demonstrated the hollowness and insincerity of the whole transaction upon the part of the English Queen, and the faction

¹ MS. Letter, St. P. Off. B. C. Carlisle, 29 August, 1570, Sussex to the Queen's Majesty.

² MS. Letter, St. P. Off. B. C. Carlisle. Sussex to Cecil, 29th Aug. 1570.

which she supported. Secretary Cecil and Sir Walter Mildmay had repaired to Mary at Chatsworth. They had proposed to her the conditions of an accommodation, and after taking the advice of her commissioners, and communicating with the King of France and the Duke of Alva,¹ whose answers she received, she had declared her acquiescence. All matters appeared to be upon the eve of a speedy arrangement, and it only remained for the English and Scottish commissioners to have a final discussion, when new demands, to which it was impossible for the Scottish Queen to submit, were started by Elizabeth, and Morton for the first time declared, that his instructions were limited to a general authority to treat of the amity of the kingdoms, and that he and his colleagues had no power to receive their queen into Scotland, or to give up to Elizabeth the person of their infant sovereign.²

This declaration, Lesly, the Bishop of Ross, with a pardonable warmth characterised as an unworthy subterfuge, complained that his mistress had been deceived, and insisted that if there was any sincerity upon the part of the English Queen, the treaty for the restoration of the queen of Scots might be terminated upon terms of perfect honour and safety.³ But the appeal was addressed to ears

¹ Lealy's Negotiations, Anderson, vol. iii., pp. 109, 120, 121, 122, 123.

² Lealy's Negotiations, Anderson, vol. iii., pp. 125, 127, 130, 131, 133.

³ Lealy's Negotiations, Anderson, vol. iii., pp. 134, 137, 139.

determined to be shut against it. Morton's conduct appears to have been the result of a previous correspondence with Cecil and Sussex, he was well assured his declaration would be no-wise unacceptable to Elizabeth herself—and the result justified his expectation. The English deputies in giving a final judgment, observed that as the representatives of Mary and those of the king and the regent could not come to an agreement, they considered their commission at an end, and must break off the negotiations.¹

During all this time the regent, although professing to observe the abstinence, continued a cruel persecution of his opponents, and determined to assemble a parliament in which he might let loose upon them all the vengeance of feudal forfeiture. Against this Elizabeth remonstrated, but in such measured and feeble terms that her interference produced little effect.² It was not so, however, with Sussex, a cruel soldier, but a man of honour, who on hearing a report that a sentence of treason was about to pass upon Lethington, wrote this sharp letter to Randolph.

“ Master Randolph. I hear that Lethington is put to the horn, his lands and goods confiscated and seized ; if it so be, it doth not accord with the good faith the queen's majesty meant in the articles accorded between her highness and the Bishop of

¹ Lesly's *Negotiations*, Anderson, vol. iii., pp. 138, 139.

² Orig. draft in Cecil's hand, St. P. Off., 25th Sept., 1570, Minute of the Queen's Maj., letter to Sussex.

Ross, nor with the writing I subscribed, and therefore I have written to the regent and others in that matter. * * * And although I, for my part, be too simple to be made a minister in princes causes, yet truly I weigh mine own honour so much, as I will not be made a minister to subscribe to any thing wherein my good faith and true meaning should be abused to my dishonour, or any person trusting to that he shall accord in writing with me, should thereby be by fraud deceived.”¹

At this moment nothing could exceed the exasperation of the two parties, who employed every method they could devise to blacken each other. The regent was branded by Huntly, the lieutenant for the queen, as a stranger and alien, a man sworn to the service of England, supported by foreign power, and dead to every honourable and patriotic feeling. Huntly and his friends, on the other hand, were attacked as traitors to the government, enemies to religion, band-breakers, assassins of the late virtuous and godly regent, and associates in that infamous band for the murder of their sovereign, which many had seen and well remembered. They replied, that if they were guilty or cognizant of the murder, their opponents were not less so, and produced the band itself signed by Murray, the regent, amongst other names. It was answered, that this was not the *true* contract for the king's murder, which Lethington had abstracted, and

¹ Copy of the time, St. P. Off. 8th Oct., 1570. Sussex to Randolph. Also Diurnal of Occurrents, p. 193.

now produced another in its place. The disputes became public, and Randolph, who felt indignant at the attack upon his old friend, the regent Murray, addressed a remarkable letter to Cecil in his defence. "Divers," said he, "since the death of the late regent, some to cover their own doings, (how wicked soever they have been) some to advance their own cause grounded upon never so much injustice and untruth, seek to make the late regent odious to the world, spreading after his death such rumours of him as they think doth make most to their advantage towards their innocency in crimes that they are burdened with, and would fain be thought guiltless of, which is not only daily done here among themselves, but spread so far abroad, as they think to find any man that will give credit either to their word or writing."

He then continued, "to name such as are yet here living most notoriously known to have been chief consenters to the king's death, I mind not, only I will say, that the universal bruit cometh upon three or four persons, which subscribed into a 'band,' promising to concur, and assist each other in doing the same. This band was kept in the castle in a little coffer or desk, covered with green, and after the apprehension of the Scottish Queen at Carberry-hill, was taken out of the place where it lay by the laird of Liddington in presence of Mr. James Balfour, then clerk of the register, and keeper of the keys where the registers are.

This being a thing so notoriously known, as well by Mr. James Balfour's own report, as the testimony of others that have seen the same, is utterly denied to be true, and another band produced, which they allege to be it (containing no such matter, at the which, with divers other noblemen's hands, the regent's was also), made a long time before the band of the king's murder was made;—and now [they] say, that if it can be proved by any band, that they consented unto the king's death, the late regent is as guilty as they; and for testimony thereof, as I am credibly informed [they] have sent a band to be seen in England, which is either some new band made among themselves, and the late regent's hand counterfeited at the same (which in some other causes I know hath been done), or the old band, at which his very own hand is, containing no such matter.

“Wherefore (continued Randolph to Cecil), knowing so much of his innocency in so horrible a crime, besides the honour of so noble and worthy a personage, so dear a friend to the Queen's Majesty my sovereign, I am loath, that after his death his adversaries should, by false report, abuse the honest and godly, especially her Majesty, with such writings as they may either frame themselves, or with such reports as are altogether void of truth. With this I am bold myself to trouble your honour, and wish that the truth hereof were as well known to all other, as I am assured myself that he was never participant of the king's

death, how maliciously soever he be burdened therewith.”¹

Amidst these mutual heartburnings and accusations, the party of the Church, still led by Knox, warmly espoused the cause of the regent and the interests of Elizabeth. He had bitterly deplored the loss of Murray, and, aware of Mary’s application for succour to the Courts of Spain and France, two powers connected, in his mind, with every thing that was corrupt and idolatrous, he denounced her intrigues in the pulpit, and inveighed against her as a murderer and an aduress, in his usual strain of passionate and personal invective. “It has been objected against me,” said he, “that I have ceased to pray for my sovereign, and have used railing imprecations against her. Sovereign to me she is not, neither am I bound to pray for her in this place. My accusers, indeed, term her their sovereign, and themselves the nobility and subjects professing her obedience; but in this they confess themselves traitors, and so I am not bound to answer them. * * * As to the imprecations made against her, I have willingly confessed, that I have desired, and in my heart desire, that God of his mercy, for the comfort of his poor flock within this realm, will oppose his power to her pride, and confound her and her flatterers, and assisters in their impiety. I praise my God, he of his mercy hath not disappointed me of my just

¹ MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Edinb. 15th Oct. 1570, Randolph to Cecil.

prayer, let them call it imprecation or execration, as pleases them. It has oftener than once stricken and shall strike in despite of man, maintain and defend her whoso list. I am farther accused," he continued, "that I speak of their sovereign (mine she is not) as that she were reprobate, affirming that she cannot repent; whereto, I answer that the accuser is a calumniator and a manifest liar, for he is never able to prove that at any time I have said that she could not repent; but I have said, and yet say, that pride and repentance abide not in one heart of any long continuance." "What I have spoken against the adultery, against the murders, against the pride, and against the idolatry of that wicked woman, I spake not as one that entered into God's secret counsel, but being one, of God's great mercy, called to preach, according to his blessed will revealed in his holy word, I have oftener than once pronounced the threatenings of his law against such as have been of counsel, knowledge, assistance, or consent, that innocent blood should be shed. And this same thing I have pronounced against all, and sundry, that go about to maintain that wicked woman and the band of those murderers, that they suffer not the death according to his word, that the plague may be taken away from this land, which shall never be, so long as she and they remain unpunished, according to the sentence of God's law."¹

To enter into the minute details of that mise-

¹ Bannatyne's Journal, pp. 109, 112, inclusive.

rable civil war, by which the country was daily ravaged, and the passions of the two rival factions wrought up to the highest pitch of exasperation, would be a sad and unprofitable task. Notwithstanding some assistance in arms and money from France and Spain,¹ and the incessant exertions of Grange and Lethington to keep up the spirit of the queen's friends, it was evident that they were becoming exhausted under the long-protracted struggle; and the capture of Dumbarton castle by the regent, which occurred at this time, gave a severe shock to their fortunes.

This exploit for its extraordinary gallantry and success deserves notice. The castle, as is well known, is strongly situated on a precipitous rock, which rises abruptly from the Clyde, at the confluence of the little river Leven with this noble æstuary. It was commanded by Lord Fleming, who, from the beginning of the war had kept it for the queen, and its importance was great, not only from its strength, which made many pronounce it impregnable, but because its situation on the Clyde rendered it at all times accessible to foreign ships, which brought supplies.

Captain Crawford, of Jordanhill, to whom the attack was entrusted, had been long attached to the House of Lennox. He was the same person whose evidence was so important regarding the death of Darnley, and who afterwards accused Lethington of participation in the murder, since which

¹ History of James the Sext, pp. 62, 64.

time he appears to have followed the profession of arms. In the enterprise he was assisted by Cunningham, commonly called the Laird of Drumwhassel, one of the bravest and most skilful officers of his time, and he had been fortunate in securing the assistance of a man, named Robertson, who, having once been warder in the castle, knew every step upon the rock familiarly, and for a bribe consented to betray it.

With this man Crawford and his company marched from Glasgow after sunset. He had sent before him a few light horse, who prevented intelligence by stopping all passengers, and arrived about midnight at Dumbich, within a mile of the castle, where he was joined by Drumwhassel and Captain Hume, with a hundred men. Here he explained to the soldiers the hazardous service on which they were to be employed, provided them with ropes and scaling ladders, and advancing with silence and celerity, reached the rock, the summit of which was fortunately involved in a heavy fog, whilst the bottom was clear. But on the first attempt all was likely to be lost. The ladders lost their hold, whilst the soldiers were upon them; and had the garrison been on the alert the noise must inevitably have betrayed them. They listened, however, and all was still, again their ladders were fixed, and their steel hooks this time catching firmly in the crevices; they gained a small jutting out ledge, where an ash tree had struck its roots, which assisted them, as they fixed their ropes to its

branches and thus speedily towed up both the ladders and the rest of their companions.

They were still, however, far from their object. They had reached but the middle of the rock, day was breaking, and when for the second time they placed their ladders, an extraordinary impediment occurred. One of the soldiers in ascending was seized with a fit, in which he convulsively grasped the steps so firmly, that no one could either pass him or unloose his hold. But Crawford's presence of mind suggested a ready expedient; he tied him to the ladder, turned it and easily ascended with the rest of his men. They were now at the bottom of the wall, where the footing was narrow and precarious, but once more fixing their ladders in the cope stone, Alexander Ramsay, Crawford's ensign, with two other soldiers, stole up, and though instantly discovered on the summit by the sentinel, who gave the alarm, leapt down and slew him, sustaining the attack of three of the guard till he was joined by Crawford and his soldiers. Their weight and struggles to surmount it, now brought down the old wall and afforded an open breach, through which they rushed in, shouting, a "Darnley, a Darnley," Crawford's watch word, given evidently from affection for his unfortunate master, the late king. The garrison were panic struck, and did not attempt resistance; Fleming the governor, from long familiarity with the place, managed to escape down the face of an almost perpendicular cleft or gully in the rock, and passing through a postern, which opened

upon the Clyde, threw himself into a fishing boat and passed over to Argyleshire.¹

In this exploit the assailants did not lose a man, and of the garrison only four soldiers were slain. In the Castle were taken prisoners, Hamilton, the Bishop of St. Andrew's, who was found with his mail shirt and steel cap on ;² Verac, the French ambassador, Fleming of Boghall, and John Hall, an English gentleman, who had fled to Scotland after Dacre's rebellion. Lady Fleming, the wife of the governor, was also taken, and treated by the regent with great courtesy, permitted to go free, and to carry off with her her plate and furniture ; but Hamilton, the primate, was instantly brought to trial for the murder of the king, and the late regent, condemned, hanged, and quartered, without delay. Of his being not only cognizant, but deeply implicated in both conspiracies, there seems little doubt,³ but the rapidity with which the legal proceedings were hurried over, and the feeling of personal vengeance which mingled with the solemn judgment of the law, caused many who were assured of his guilt to

¹ Diurnal of Occurrents, p. 203. Buchanan, Book xx. cap. 28 to 32. History of James the Sext, pp. 70, 71. Also MS. Letter, St. P. Off. B. C. Drury to the Privy Council, 3 April, 1571. Also MS. Letter, St. P. Off. B. C. Drury to the Council, 9 April, 1571.

² MS. Letter, St. P. Off. B.C. Drury to the Council, 9th April 1571.

³ Copy of the time. St. P. Off. B.C. Lord Herries to Lord Scrope, 10th April, 1571. Also MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Lennox to Burghley, 14th May, 1571.

blame his death. The reformed clergy pointed to his fate as a judgment from heaven; the people, who were aware of his corrupt life and profligate principles, rejoiced over it, and this distich was fixed to the gallows on which he suffered.

“ Cresce diu felix arbor, semperque vireto
Frondebus, qui nobis talia poma feras.”

The loss of Dumbarton was a severe shock to the Queen's cause. It gave a death blow to all hopes of foreign aid, and the regent, advanced to Edinburgh with the determination of holding a Parliament, collecting his whole force, and at once putting an end to the struggle.¹ Grange, however, still held out the Castle, keeping the citizens of the capital who favoured the king's faction in constant terror, and affording a rallying point to the queen's friends. During the late abstinence, he had been guilty of many excesses, and on one occasion had broken the common prison, and rescued one of his soldiers who had stabbed a gentleman in the street. It was said, also, that he had carried off at the same time a woman, suspected of being cognizant of the late regent's murder. Upon hearing of the outrage, Cecil, his old friend, recently created Lord Burghley, remonstrated in indignant terms, expressing his horror, that one in his high command, and who had in former years of their intimacy been a professor of the Gospel, should be guilty of so flagrant

¹ MS. Letter. St. P. Off. Regent to Cecil, (now Lord Burghley), 14th May, 1571, Leith.

a contempt of its dictates. The concluding portion of his letter is remarkable:—"How you will allow my plainness," said he, "I know not, but surely I should think myself guilty of blood, if I should not thoroughly dislike you; and to this I must add, that I hear, but yet am loath to believe it, that your soldiers that broke the prison have not only taken out the murderer, your man, but a woman that was there detained as guilty of the lamentable death of the last good regent.

"Alas! my lord, may this be true? and with your help may it be conceived in thought that you, you, I mean, that was so dear to the regent, should favour his murderers in this sort. Surely, my lord, if this be true, there is provided by God some notable work of his justice to be showed upon you; and yet I trust you are not so void of God's grace—and so for mine old friendship with you, and for the avoiding of the notable slander of God's word, I heartily wish it to be untrue. * * *. I pray you commend me to my Lord of Ledington, of whom I have heard such things as I dare not believe of him, and yet his deeds make me afraid of his well doing."

This eloquent appeal of the English minister would have been well calculated to recall Grange to his duty, had he and Lethington not been aware that there were occasions when deeds of violence, and even assassination, did not excite,

¹ Copy, St. P. Off. Endorsed by Cecil himself. "Copy of my letter to the Laird of Grange, 10th January, 1570-1."

in his placid temper, such extreme feelings of abhorrence.

In the meantime Morton, Makgill, and the Abbot of Dumfermlin returned from their negotiations in England¹ and on rejoining the Regent, it was determined to resume hostilities with vigour. Lennox issued a summons for the whole force of the realm to meet him at Linlithgow on the 19th of May, and Morton concentrated at Dalkeith the troops which were in regular service and pay.² Grange on his part, was nothing intimidated. He had received money from Mary, who, although in captivity, contrived to keep a secret intercourse with her supporters; about the same time a seasonable supply of a thousand crowns, with arms and ammunition, arrived from France.³ The duke joined him with three hundred horse and one hundred hackbutter. Lord Herries and Lord Maxwell entered the capital with two hundred and forty horse, Farnyhurst soon followed them, and the castle was so strong in its garrison and its fortifications, that he regarded the motions of his opponents with little anxiety.

On the 9th of May Lennox and Morton having united their forces, encamped at Leith, and erected a small battery on a spot called the Dow Craig,⁴ above the Trinity Church, with the object of commanding the Canongate, a principal street of the city. Here, whilst the cannon of the castle opened

¹ 19th April.

² Diurnal of Occurrents, p. 209.

³ Id. p. 211.

⁴ The Pigeons' Rock.

upon them, they assembled to hold their parliament, which was numerously attended, and fulminated a sentence of forfeiture against Lethington, his brother Thomas Maitland, and others of the most obnoxious of their opponents. Having hurried through these proceedings, they broke up their assembly, and abandoned the siege, whilst Grange immediately held a rival parliament in the queen's name, and attacked his enemies with their own weapons.¹

It is impossible to conceive a more miserable spectacle than that presented at this moment by the country and the capital—the country torn and desolated by the struggles of two exasperated factions, whose passions became every day more fierce and implacable, so that the very children fought under the name of king's and queen's men,² the capital in a state of siege, whilst the wretched citizens placed between the fires of the castle and the camp of the Regent, were compelled to intermit their peaceful labours, and either to serve under the queen's banner, or to join Lennox, and have their property confiscated. Two hundred chose this last severe alternative, and fled to the camp at Leith, upon which Grange passionately deposed the provost and magistrates, and placed Car, of Farnyhirst, a fierce and powerful border chief, in the civic chair, with a council of his retainers to act as bailies.³

¹ Diurnal of Occurrents, p. 215. History of James the Sext, p. 87.

² Crawford, p. 179:

³ Diurnal, p. 226.

Amid these transactions Sir William Drury, the marshall of Berwick, had been sent by Elizabeth to open negotiations with the leaders of the two factions, and if possible to bring about a pacification. Such at least was the avowed object of his mission, but the court of England have been accused by Sir James Melvil of acting at this moment with great duplicity,¹ the various ministers whom they sent into Scotland, if we may believe this writer, a man of character and intimately acquainted with the times and the actors, were instructed to widen rather than to heal the wounds of the country, and it is certain that Drury's conferences with Kirkaldy, Morton, and Lennox, were followed by fiercer struggles than before. Nor were English intrigue, and the jealous or selfish passions of the rival factions, the only causes of the continuance of this unhappy state of things. Fanaticism added her horrors to the war, and the reformed clergy by a refusal to pray for the queen, inflamed the resentment of her friends, and gave an example of rancour to the people. Knox, their great leader, had some time before declared his determination never to acknowledge her authority, and no longer to supplicate God for her welfare.² On the entry of his enemies the Hamiltons into the capital, he had been compelled to a pre-

¹ Melvil's *Memoirs*, p. 240. MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Morton to Elizabeth, Leith, 23 August, 1571.

² *Diurnal of Occurrents*, p. 225. *History of James the Sext*, p. 193. *Bannatyne's Journal*, p. 98.

capitate retreat,¹ but his flight was followed by more resolute measures on the part of the Kirk and the clergy, an assembly being convoked some time after at Stirling, which confirmed his judgment and reiterated their refusal.²

Grange now determined to hold a parliament in Edinburgh, whilst the regent and the king's lords resolved to assemble the three estates in Stirling. On the queen's side sentences of forfeiture and treason were pronounced against Lennox the regent, Morton, and Mar, the Lords Lindsay, Hay, Cathcart, Glamis, Ochiltree, Makgill Clerk Register, the Bishop of Orkney, and a long list of the king's faction, amounting nearly to two hundred persons.³ The assembly, however, which was only attended by two of the spiritual and three of the higher temporal lords, was scarcely entitled to the name of a parliament.⁴ On the other hand their opponents, with a greater attendance of the nobility, and a more solemn state, met at Stirling. Here the young king, then an infant of five years, was invested in his royal robes, and carried from the palace to the parliament by his governor the Earl of Mar, where he read a speech which had been prepared for him.⁵

¹ History of James the Sext, p. 75. Bannatyne's Journal, p. 118.

² History of James the Sext, p. 80.

³ Diurnal, p. 236, 242, 243.

⁴ Spottiswood, p. 256. MS. St. P. Off. Aug. 1571. The speech of the king in the Tolbooth.

⁵ MS. Letter, St. P. Off. John Case to —, Stirling, 29th Aug., 1571.

The doom of treason was then pronounced upon the Duke of Chastelherault, the Earl of Huntly, Sir William Kirkaldy of Grange, Lord Claud Hamilton, the Abbot of Arbroath, Sir James Balfour, Robert, afterwards Sir Robert Melvil, and many others; whilst it was determined to dispatch immediately an embassy to Elizabeth for the purpose of concluding a more intimate alliance, and assuring her of their speedy triumph over the faction of the Scottish Queen.¹ Before the parliament separated a slight circumstance occurred which was much talked of at the time. The little king, in a pause of the proceedings, turning to his governor asked him, what house they were sitting in? On being answered that it was called the parliament house, he looked up to the roof, and pointing to a small aperture which his quick eye had detected, observed, that there was a hole in that parliament. People smiled, but the superstitious declared that it augured disaster to the regent, whose death occurred only five days after,² in an enterprise which seemed likely at first to have brought the war on Grange's side to a fortunate and glorious conclusion.

This able soldier, having learnt the insecurity with which the regent and his friends were quartered at Stirling, concluded that it would not be difficult by a rapid night march to surprise the city. Huntly, Lord Claud Hamilton, Buccleugh,

¹ MS. St. P. Off., Aug. 1571. Persons forfeited in Scotland. Maitland, vol. ii. 1124. Diurnal of Occurrents, p. 245.

² History of James the Sext, p. 88.

Spens of Wormiston, one of the bravest and most successful captains who had been bred in these wars, Car of Farnyhirst, and two officers named Bell and Calder, were the leaders whom he selected. Their force consisted of sixty mounted hackbutter and three hundred and forty border horse, and as Bell had been born in Stirling and knew every lane and alley, no better guide could have been chosen. This little force rode out of Edinburgh in the evening of the third of September, some horsemen having been previously sent to the ferry and other parts between Stirling and the capital to arrest all passengers and prevent any information being carried there.¹ They first took the road towards Peebles, and it was reported in the enemy's camp at Leith, that they meditated an attack upon Jedburgh. Favoured by the night, however, they wheeled off in the direction of Stirling, and having left their horses about a mile from that city, entered it on foot by a secret passage in the grey of the morning before the inhabitants were stirring. So complete was the surprise, that they occupied every street without difficulty,² broke up the noblemen's houses, and in an incredibly short time took prisoners the Regent himself, the Earls of Morton, Glencairn, Argile, Cassillis, Eglinton, Montrose, and Buchan, with

¹ MS. Letter, St. P. Off. From Scotland—a spy to Lord Burghley, 5th Sept. 1571. Also MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Grange and Lethington to Sir William Drury, 6th Sep. 1571.

² MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Grange and Maitland to Drury, 6th Sept. 1571.

the Lords Semple, Cathcart, and Ochiltree. These were placed under a guard in their houses, and at this moment, had the borderers kept together, the victory was complete; but the Liddesdale men went to the spoil, emptied the stables of their horses, broke up the merchants' booths, encumbered themselves with booty, and dispersed in the lanes instead of watching the prisoners. It happened here, too, as is often the case in an action of this kind, that a few minutes are often invaluable. Morton, before he was taken, had blockaded his house, and refusing to surrender till it was set on fire, his resistance gave the townsmen time to recover themselves. Mar, in the meantime, rushing from the castle with forty soldiers commenced a fire from an unfurnished lodging which still fronts the high-street, and drove Huntly and Buccleugh with their prisoners from the market place to another quarter where they were assailed by the citizens on all sides; whilst Lennox, Morton, and the rest of the noblemen so lately captives snatched up such weapons as were at hand in the confusion and soon put their enemies to flight.

In the midst of this confusion and struggle, captain Calder, rendered furious by the disappointment, determined that the Regent at least should not escape, and coming up behind, shot him through the back; Lennox had been made prisoner by Spens of Wormiston, and this brave and generous man perceiving Calder's cruel intention, threw himself between them, and received the same shot in his body, and

was then hacked to pieces by the soldiers, Lennox faintly imploring them to spare one who had risked his life in his defence. Calder afterwards confessed that he was instigated to this savage deed by Lord Claud Hamilton and Huntly, before they took the town, in revenge for the death of the Archbishop of St. Andrew's, whose ignominious execution, the Hamiltons had sworn to visit to the uttermost upon the Regent. A swift vengeance, however, overtook his assassin, for he and Bell, the chief leader of the enterprise, having fallen into the hands of the enemy, were instantly executed—Bell being hanged, having first been put to the torture, and Calder broke upon the wheel.¹

Buccleugh was taken, only nine of the Queen's party slain, and sixteen made prisoners. The loss would have been much greater, but that the Liddesdale and Tiviotdale borderers had stolen every

¹ Second examination of Bell, St. P. Off. 6 September, 1571. George Bell * * being put to pains, declares he came running down the gate for Huntly and Claud, and cried "shoot the Regent! the traitor is coming upon us, and ye will not get him away." Declared also that Claud enquired of this deponer where is the Regent? who answered again, he is down the gait, who gave commandment to him to follow, and gar slay him, and so past down and bad shoot him as he else said. In the meantime Warmestoun bad seek a horse to carry him away." There is also in the St. P. Off. the examination of Captain Calder or Cadder, who confesses that he shot the Regent, and before coming to Stirling, that he had received orders from Huntly and Lord Claud Hamilton to shoot both the Regent and the Earl of Morton. MS. St. P. Off. 6 Sept. 1571.

hoof within the town, and not a horse could be found to give the chase. It was certainly even with its half success, a daring exploit, and Grange, in a letter, written a few days after, whilst he deplored the fate of the Regent, could not refrain from some expressions of exultation "In their parliament time (said he) when all their lords, being twenty earls and lords spiritual and temporal were convened in their principal strength, wherein there were above two thousand men, three hundred of ours entered among them, were masters of the town, at least for the space of three hours, might have slain the whole noblemen if they had pleased, and retired themselves in the end with a rich booty, and without any harm."¹ The unfortunate Regent was able to keep his seat on horseback till he entered the Castle of Stirling, but the first view of his wound convinced every one that it was mortal, and his own feelings telling him he had but a few hours to live, he begged the chief nobles to come to his bed-side. Here he recommended the young king, his grandson, to their affectionate care, reminded them that as he had been faithful to his office, and had sealed his services with his blood, so he trusted they would fill his place by a man that feared God and loved his country. For his servants, they knew he had been cut off before he could reward them, so he must leave their recompense to his friends—for himself, he would only ask their

¹ MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Drury to Burghley, 13 September, 1571.

prayers, and for my poor wife Meg, said he, turning to Mar and wringing his hand, you, my lord, must remember me lovingly to her, and do your best for her comfort.¹ He died that same evening, the 4th of September, and on the succeeding day the Earl of Mar, governor to the young king, was chosen Regent. His competitors for the office were Argile, whom Morton had induced to join the king's faction, and Morton himself, who was supported by English influence; but the majority declared for Mar, whose character for honesty in these profligate times stood higher than that of any of the nobles.²

On his accession to the supreme power, Mar confidently hoped, that by a judicious mixture of vigour and conciliation, he should be able to reduce the opposite faction, and restore peace to the country;³ but the difficulties he had to contend against were infinitely more complicated than he anticipated. On the one hand Grange's position was strong, and his military resources far from being

¹ MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Drury to Burghley. Berwick, 10 Sep. 1571. Spottiswood, p. 257.

² MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Sept. 14, Berwick. Drury to Burghley. Also Spottiswood, p. 257. In a letter of Drury's to Burghley, MS. St. P. Off. B. C. Sept. 5, 1571, he says, speaking of Lennox's reported death, "If it be true, the Queen's Majesty hath received a great loss, the like in affection she will never find of a Scottish man born person."

³ MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Berwick. Sept. 14, 1571. Drury to Burghley. Drury gives Mar a high character as "one of the best nature in Scotland, and wholly given to quietness and peace."

exhausted, as the regent himself soon experienced, for after an attempt to bombard the city first on the east side, and afterwards by a strong battery on the south, in a spot called the Pleasance, the name it still bears, he was silenced in both quarters, and forced to retire on Leith.¹ On the other hand, every attempt at negotiation was defeated by the unreasonable and overbearing conduct of Morton, who had entirely governed the late regent, and determined either to rule or to overwhelm his successor. This daring and crafty man, who was the slave of ambition, knew well that his best chance of securing the supreme power lay in keeping up the commotions of the country, and in this perfidious effort he received rather countenance than opposition from the government of England. So successful were his efforts, that for some months after Mar's accession to the regency, and during the siege of the capital, the war assumed an aspect of unexampled ferocity.

In the midst of all this misery, the supporters of the captive queen were generally successful. Mar had been compelled to abandon the siege of Edinburgh, and now sent an earnest petition for assistance from Elizabeth.² In the North, Adam Gordon of Auchendown, Huntly's brother, defeated the

¹ MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Berwick. Oct. 9, 1571. Drury to Burghley. MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Hunsdon to Burghley, Berwick, Nov. 4, 1571.

² MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Endorsed by Cecil. Cunningham's demands. Oct. 1, 1571.

king's adherents in repeated actions, and brought the whole of the country under Mary's obedience.¹ Gordon's talents for war were of the first order, and in his character we find a singular mixture of knightly chivalry, with the ferocity of the highland freebooter. Of the first he exhibited a striking instance at Brechin, where, after a total defeat given to the Earl of Buchan, he generously dismissed nearly two hundred prisoners, most of them gentlemen, without ransom or exchange. Of his vengeance, a dreadful example was given in his burning the castle of Towie, with its unfortunate mistress the Lady Forbes, and her whole household, thirty-seven in number.² In her husband's absence, she had undertaken its defence, and too rashly defied him from the battlements. Such a combination as that exhibited by Gordon was no unfrequent production in these dark and sanguinary times.³

Meanwhile, in England, was discovered a new intrigue of the Duke of Norfolk for his marriage with the Scottish Queen. This nobleman had been liberated from the Tower, under the most solemn promises, to forsake all intercourse with Mary; but his ambition overmastered both prudence and honour, and he had again embarked deeply with the Bishop of Ross and other friends

¹ History of James the Sext, p. 109, 113 inclusive.

² History of James the Sext, pp. 97, 111. Crawford in his Memoirs, p. 213, attempts to defend Gordon from the exploit, because it was executed by one of his captains named Ker—but gives no proof that it was done without Gordon's orders.

of the captive princess, in their schemes for her restoration and marriage. It was not to be expected that the English Queen should again pardon so dangerous an attempt, and her animosity was roused to the highest pitch, when she discovered the skill with which the plot had been carried on ; its ramifications with her own Roman Catholic subjects, its favourable reception by the Courts of France and Spain, and the undiminished spirit and enterprise of Mary. Norfolk was accordingly tried and executed, the Bishop of Ross sent to the Tower, and a determined resolution embraced and openly declared by Elizabeth, that henceforth she would forsake all thoughts of the Scottish Queen's restoration, and compel a universal obedience to the government of the king her son.

To obtain this, however, she was unwilling to incur the expense of an army, or the risk of a defeat. And by her orders, Sir William Drury, the Marshall of Berwick, and Lord Hunsdon, the governor, began a correspondence with Grange, with the object of bringing him to terms. Lord Burghley, also, after a silence of two years, sent a friendly message to Lethington, and the secretary seemed rejoiced that their intercourse was renewed. He lamented their interrupted friendship, expressed satisfaction that some seeds of love yet remained, and trusted they would still produce either flower or fruit. To go into all the history of these sad times, he said, or of his conduct in them, would be as tedious as to declare, "*Bellum Trojanum ab*

Ovo." But this he would say, that since the beginning of their acquaintance, he had revered him as a father, and followed his counsels as of the dearest friend he had. As to Drury's messages, the matters they had to treat of were such as related to honour, duty, and surety, no light subjects. They proposed, therefore, to send a special messenger to the Queen's Majesty, to inform her particularly of their intentions, and, in return, expected that she would grant a commission, either to Drury or some other person, who should be empowered to conclude a treaty with them.¹

This high tone appears to have disgusted Elizabeth; Drury's letters led to no satisfactory result, and Lord Hunsdon after a tedious correspondence was equally unsuccessful. He was instructed to bring over the queen's faction either by negotiation or by force, but when Grange discovered that he had no commission from his royal mistress to bind her by any positive agreement he wisely rejected his offers, and as the force of which he talked did not appear to be forthcoming, totally disregarded his threats. There is, indeed, every reason to believe that Elizabeth's chief object at this moment in the negotiations with Mary's supporters was, to ascertain their exact strength and the practicability of reducing the kingdom under the king's obedience.²

¹ MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Lethington to Burghley, Castle of Edinburgh, 26th October, 1571.

² MS. Letter, St. P. Off. 10th November, 1571, Berwick. Hunsdon to the Lairds of Lethington and Grange. And also copy

Meanwhile, owing to the season of the year, for winter was commencing, she determined to delay all hostilities and permit the rival factions to exhaust each other, confident that her interest would not materially suffer by the delay. Nor were her hopes in this disappointed. For many miserable months Scotland presented a sight which might have drawn pity from the hardest heart, her sons engaged in a furious and constant butchery of each other,¹ every peaceful or useful art entirely at a stand, her agriculture, her commerce and manufactures neglected, nothing heard from one end of the country to the other but the clangour of arms and the roar of artillery, nothing seen but villages in flames, towns beleagured by armed men, women and children flying from the cottages where their fathers or husbands had been massacred, and even the pulpit and the altar surrounded by a steel-clad congregation which listened tremblingly with their hands upon their weapons. Into all the separate facts which would support this dreadful picture I must not enter, nor would I willingly conduct my reader through the shambles of a civil war. Prisoners were tortured or massacred in cold blood, or hung by forties and fifties at a time. Coun-

of the time, St. P. Off. Grange and Lethington to Hunsdon, Edinburgh Castle, 9th Dec. 1571.

¹ MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Randolph and Drury to Leicester and Burghley. Leith, Feb. 23rd., 1571-2. Also *ibid.* Same to Hunsdon, Leith, Feb. 26th, 1571-2. Also MS. Letter, Randolph and Drury to Lord Hunsdon, Leith, 10th April, 1572.

trymen driving their carts, or attempting to sell their stores in the city, were hanged or branded with a hot iron. Women coming to market were seized and scourged, and as the punishment did not prevent repetition of the offence, one delinquent who ventured to retail her country produce, was barbarously hanged in her own village near the city.¹ These are homely details, but they point to much intensity of national misery, and made so deep an impression, that the period, taking its name from Morton, was long after remembered as the days of the "Douglas wars."

When we consider the aggregate of human misery and guilt which such a state of things supposes, it is impossible to withhold our abhorrence at the cold-blooded policy which for its own ends could foster its continuance. Yet at this moment Elizabeth appears to have secured the services of Morton by a pension, and these services were wholly directed to oppose every effort made by the regent to restore peace to the country.² His principle was never to sheath the sword till his enemies had unconditionally surrendered, and the cause of the captive queen should be rendered utterly hopeless.

Such a consummation, however, seemed still distant. The efforts of Gordon in the north,

¹ The village of West Edmonston. Diurnal of Occurrents, p. 296. History of James the Sext, p. 103.

² MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Instruction by Morton, given to Sir William Drury to communicate to the Queen's Majesty. About 28th Nov. 1571.

and Kirkaldy and Lethington in the capital, exhibited no signs of feebleness. Even the shocking severities I have mentioned of Morton, produced little other feelings than execrations against their author; and, before the middle of summer, 1572, the affairs of the queen were once more in a prosperous condition. Gordon had completely triumphed in the north;¹ her supporters were masters of the principal city and the strongest fortress in the kingdom; they had been repeatedly supplied with money, arms, and ammunition, by France and Spain, and of the continued assistance of the latter at least had no reason to despair.² They had defeated Lord Semple in the West, their arms under Farnyhurst had carried all before them in the South, it was evident from her long delays that the queen of England had some invincible repugnance to send any force to bombard the castle of Edinburgh, and if she did they were in want of nothing for their defence, whilst their garrisons of Niddry, Livingston and Blackness,³ amply supplied them with provisions.

At this crisis Elizabeth, who looked with alarm upon the increasing strength of her opponents, proposed an abstinence for two months, preparatory

¹ MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Drury to Lord Hunsdon, Restalrig, 9 July, 1572.

² MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Randolph and Drury to Lord Hunsdon, 26 February, 1571-2. Also MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Mar to Burghley, April 31, 1572.

³ MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Drury and Randolph to Hunsdon, 17 April, 1572.

as she said, to the conclusion of a general peace, on terms which should secure the honour and safety of the queen's supporters. The negotiations were managed by Sir William Drury and the French ambassador De Croc, whose services, from the league recently entered into between France and England, were not so cordially given to the captive queen as on former occasions. It seems strange, that so able a statesman as Lethington, and one so intimately acquainted with the duplicity of the English Queen, should on this occasion have been prevailed upon to consent to a measure which ultimately proved the ruin of his mistress's cause.¹ But he and Grange had been branded by their opponents as men of blood, who had obstinately refused to give a breathing time to their bleeding and exhausted country, and to confute the aspersion they agreed to the abstinence. It was signed on the 30th of July, and contained an express provision, that, as soon as might be, the Nobility and Estates of the realm should assemble to deliberate upon a general peace. On the same day the truce was proclaimed in the capital, amid the shouts and joy of the inhabitants, and the now harmless thunder of the ordnance of the castle.

Having thus suffered themselves to be over-

¹ MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Edinburgh Castle, 13 July, 1572. Lethington and Grange to my Lord Ambassador of England. MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Drury to Burghley, Resterwick, (Restalrig) 18 July, 1572. Ibid. Copy of the time, 30 July, 1572. Abstinence of hostility, signed by the Castilians.

reached by their crafty opponents, Kirkaldy and Lethington were not long allowed to be ignorant of their fatal blunder. Mar, the regent, was indeed sincere, but he was completely controlled by Morton. This ambitious man now ruled the council at his will; he successfully thwarted every effort to assemble the Estates, or deliberate upon a general pacification; and unfortunately for Scotland, a calamity occurred at this moment which struck all Europe with horror, and produced the most fatal effects upon any negotiations with which Mary and her supporters were connected.¹ This was the massacre of St. Bartholomew, an event exhibiting in dreadful reality, the result of Popish principles and intrigue; and which, though applauded in those dark times, is now happily regarded alike by Romanists and Protestants with unmingled feelings of execration and disgust. Five hundred Protestant gentlemen and men of rank, and about ten thousand of inferior condition were butchered in cold blood, the greater part in the capital of France, where the king himself, it was reported, directed the assassins, looking from the windows of his palace upon the miserable victims who fled from their assailants.² In the provinces the same dreadful scenes were repeated, and when the news arrived in England, communicated by Walsingham, Elizabeth's ambassador, at the court of Charles the IX., the sudden-

¹ MS. Letter, St. P. Off. B.C. Sir William Drury to Lord Burghley, 15 September, 1572.

² Turner's Elizabeth, vol. iv. Hist. of England, p. 322.

ness of the shock electrified the whole country. Grief, pity, and indignation, shook the national mind as if it had been that of one man. When Fenelon, the French ambassador, presented himself at the palace, he found the queen and the court clad in mourning. He was received in silence—the stillness of the grave, as he himself described it, seemed to reign in the apartments; the queen indeed endeavoured to preserve her equanimity; and although deeply sorrowful, received him without complaint, but the courtiers fixing their eyes on the ground refused to notice his greeting. Instead of a palace, he seemed to have entered a chamber of death, where men were met to mourn for their dearest friends.¹

But sorrow and indignation were not the only, or even the strongest, feelings excited on this occasion in the breast of Elizabeth. She had indeed recently concluded a league with France; yet this, though it restrained the outward violence, did not diminish the intensity of her feelings. Fears for her own life, and terror for the result of those dark plots, which she had already repeatedly detected and severely punished, perpetually haunted her imagination, and shook even her strong and masculine mind. Of these conspiracies Mary was the centre; she was engaged in a perpetual correspondence with the court of Rome, with France, whose name could not now be uttered without calling up images of horror; with Spain, where

¹ Carte, vol. iii. p. 522. Lingard, vol. viii. pp. 113, 114.

Philip and the Duke of Alva, men hated by the Protestants, had recently lent her the most effectual assistance, and what was more alarming to Elizabeth than all, the recent trial of Norfolk, and the confessions of the Bishop of Ross, now a prisoner in the Tower, had convinced her, that as long as the Scottish Queen remained in England, the minds of her Roman Catholic subjects would be kept in perpetual agitation; that no permanent tranquillity could be reasonably expected, and that judging by the recent excesses in France, her own life might not be secure.

It is impossible to blame such feelings or such conclusions. They were natural and inevitable; but making every allowance for the fears of her council and her people, and the attachment of her great minister Burghley, we are scarcely prepared for the calmness with which the death of the Scottish Queen was recommended by the House of Commons, and strongly urged by Cecil. Elizabeth, however, would not listen to their arguments, and at last peremptorily put an end to their consultations.¹ She had already publicly declared, that there had been no sufficient evidence exhibited against Mary by those who accused her of the death of her husband; and to bring her to trial in England,

¹ The English Bishops, in answer to a question of Burghley's, had given it as their opinion, that Elizabeth might lawfully put Mary to death, and justified their sentence by reasons of Scripture taken from the Old Testament. See Caligula, C. ii., fol. 524, and D'Ewes' Journal, p. 507. Also Lingard, vol. viii. pp. 106-108.

or to cause her to be publicly put to death without trial, would, she felt, be equally unjust and odious. She accordingly contented herself, after the death of Norfolk, with sending Lord de la Ware, Sir R. Sadler, and Bromley her Solicitor-general, to interrogate the Scottish Queen regarding her political connection with that unfortunate man, and to remonstrate against any continuation of her intrigues.¹ On this occasion, Mary, although plunged in grief for the recent execution of the duke, was roused by the harshness of the messengers to a spirited vindication of her rights as a free princess. Some of the allegations she admitted, some she palliated, others she peremptorily denied, and the interview led, and was probably intended to lead, to no definite result.

But if Elizabeth abandoned all thoughts of bringing her royal prisoner to a public trial, and putting her to death in England, it was only to embrace a more dark and secret expedient, and what she judged a surer mode of getting rid of her hated and dangerous prisoner. The plot was an extraordinary one, and its details, upon which I now enter, are new to this part of our history.

Previous to the massacre of Saint Bartholomew, and after the failure of the negotiations for peace

¹ Camden, p. 442. MS. St. P. Off. Papers of Mary Queen of Scots. The Lord Delaware's and the rest of the commissioners proceedings with the Scottish Queen, June 11, 1572. Also MS. Draft by Cecil, St. P. Off. Minute to the Scottish Queen by the Lord Delaware, &c.

in Scotland, which were conducted by the French ambassador De Croc and Sir William Drury, Elizabeth had resolved to send a new envoy to that country, with the object of watching over the English interests. When the dreadful news arrived from France, Burghley and Leicester pressed upon the English Queen the necessity of instant attention to her safety on the side of Scotland, and Mr. Henry Killigrew was selected to proceed thither.¹ He was instructed to negotiate both with Mar, the regent, and the opposite faction led by Lethington and Grange; to exhort both sides to observe the late abstinence; to give them the details of the late horrible massacre, expressing the queen's conviction that it was premeditated, and to implore them to be on their guard.

Such was his public mission, but shortly before he set out, Killigrew was informed that a far greater matter was to be entrusted to his management, that it was to be conducted with the utmost secrecy, and was known to none but Elizabeth, Leicester, and Burghley.² In an interview with the queen herself, to which none were admitted but these two lords, he received his instructions, which remain drawn up by Cecil in his own hand.³ It was explained to him, that it had

¹ MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Copy, August, 1572. Instructions to Henry Killigrew touching the troubles in Scotland, being sent thither after the Great Murder that was in France.

² MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Killigrew to Burghley and Leicester, Nov. 23, 1572.

³ Murdin, p. 224.

at last become absolutely necessary to execute the Scottish Queen, and that unless the realm were delivered of her, the life of Elizabeth was no longer safe. This might indeed be done in England, but for some good respects, it was thought better that she should be sent to Scotland, and delivered to the regent and his party, “to proceed with her by way of justice.”¹ To accomplish this must depend, it was said, upon his skilful management. He must frame matters so that the offer must come from them, not from the English Queen. This would probably not be difficult, for they had already many times before, under the former regents, made proposals of this nature. If such an offer were again made, he was now empowered to agree to it, but it must be upon the most solemn assurance, that she should be put to death without fail, and that neither England nor Scotland should be endangered by her hereafter; for otherwise, it was added, to have her and to keep her, would be of all other ways the most dangerous.² If, however, he could contrive it so that the regent, or Morton should secretly apply to some of the lords

¹ Dr. Robertson notices the paper in Murdin, and severely condemns this proposal of Elizabeth. This eminent writer interprets it, as if the Queen had desired the Scottish Regent to bring Mary to a public trial, and if condemnation followed, to execute her. It seems to me clear, however, that the words “*proceed with her way by way of justice*,” when taken with the context, can bear but one meaning, the same meaning in which Leicester employs the phrase in his letter in the Appendix, that of executing her summarily and without delay.—See Dr. Lingard, vol. viii. p. 118.

² Murdin, p. 224.

of the English Council, to have her given up, now was the best time; only, it was repeated, it must be upon absolute surety, that she should receive what she deserved, and that no further peril could ever possibly occur, either by her escape, or by setting her up again. To make certain of this, hostages must be required by him, and those of the highest rank, that is to say, children or near kinsfolk of the regent and the Earl of Morton. Last of all, he was solemnly reminded that the queen's name must not appear in the transaction, and Elizabeth herself in dismissing him, bade him remember, that none but Leicester, Burghley, and himself, were privy to the great and delicate charge which was now laid upon him, adding a caution, that if it "came forth," or was ever known, he must answer for it. To this Killigrew replied, "that he would keep the secret as he would his life," and immediately set out on his journey.¹

On entering Scotland, his first visit was to Tantallon, Morton's castle, where that nobleman was confined by sickness, but the ambassador received from him the strongest assurances of devotedness to the young king his sovereign, and to Elizabeth, whose interests he believed to be the same. Knox had returned again to Edinburgh, and the recent news of the massacre in France was producing the strongest excitement. On repairing to Stirling,

¹ MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Killigrew to Burghley and Leicester, Nov. 23, 1572.

to meet the regent, he passed through the capital, and encountered there his old friend Sir James Melvil, from whom he understood something of the state of the Castilians,¹ as the queen's party were now called, and in his subsequent interview with Mar, he found him expressing himself decidedly against any intimate alliance with France, and determined so long as he had any hope of effectual assistance from England, never to connect himself with a foreign power. So far all was favourable, but it was evident to Killigrew, that without additional forces, which he well knew Elizabeth would be unwilling to send, the regent could never make himself master of the castle.

These and similar particulars connected with his public mission, he communicated as he had been previously instructed, to the secretary of state, but his proceedings in the other great and secret matter touching Mary, were contained in letters addressed to Cecil and Leicester, jointly, and he appears to have lost no time in entering upon it. He informed them in a dispatch on the 19th of September, that he had already "dealt with a fit instrument, and expected that the Regent and the Earl of Morton would soon break their minds unto him secretly."² The instrument thus selected to manage the secret and speedy execution of the unhappy

¹ MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Killigrew to Burghley and Leicester, Sept. 14, 1572.

² MS. Letter, Brit. Mus. Caligula, C. iii. fol. 365. Killigrew to Burghley, Sept. 19, 1572.

Mary was Mr. Nicholas Elphinston, a dependant of the late Regent Murray, and who from an expression of Killigrew, appears to have been on a former occasion employed in a similar negotiation. Matters, however, were not expedited with that rapidity which Burghley deemed necessary, and this minister, although assured by his agent that he could not for his life make more speed than he had done, determined to urge him forward. For this purpose he addressed to him a letter jointly from himself and Leicester. In reading it as it still exists in the original draft in Cecil's hand, with its erasures and corrections, it is striking to remark the contrast between its cold and measured style, and the cruel purpose which it advocates. It was written from Windsor, and ran thus:—

“ After our hearty commendations, we two have received your several letters directed to us, whereof the last came this last night, being of the 24th of September, and as we like well the comfort you give us of the towardness in the special matter committed to you, so we do greatly long to receive from you a further motion with some earnestness, and that both moved to you and prosecuted by them of valour, as we may look for assurance to have it take effect, for when all other ways come in consideration, none appeareth more ready to be allowed here by the best, than that which you have in hand. Wherefore we earnestly require you to employ all your labours, to procure that it may

be both earnestly and speedily followed there, and yet also secretly as the cause requireth; and when we think of the matter, as daily, yea hourly, we have cause to do, we see not but the same reasons that may move us to desire that it take effect, ought also to move them, and in some part, the more, considering both their private sureties, their common estate, and the continuance of the religion, all which three points are in more danger from [for] them to uphold than for us. The causes thereof we doubt not, but you can enlarge to them, if you see that they do not sufficiently foresee them. We suspend all our actions only upon this, and therefore you can do no greater service than to use speed.

“ Your loving friends,

“ W. BURGHLEY.”¹

“ From Windsor the 29th of Sept. 1572.”

In the interval between this letter and Killigrew's last dispatch, the English envoy had not been idle. He had assured himself of Morton's cordial co-operation in the scheme for having Mary secretly executed, and according to the instructions received from his own court, he had availed himself of the deep and general horror occasioned by the late murders in France to excite animosity against the papists, and to convince all ranks, that without the most determined measures of defence, their lives and their reli-

¹ MS. Brit. Mus. Caligula, C. iii. f. 394. This letter being a first draft by Cecil, is signed only by him.

gion would fall a sacrifice to the fury of their enemies.¹ He also had seen and consulted with Knox, who although so feeble, that he could scarce stand alone, was as entire in intellect and resolute in action as ever. The picture given of this extraordinary man by Killigrew, in a letter addressed to Cecil and Leicester, written on the 6th of October, in reply to theirs of the 29th of September, is very striking. "I trust," said he, "to satisfy Morton, and as for John Knox, that thing you may see by my dispatch to Mr. Secretary, is done, and doing daily; the people in general, well bent to England, abhorring the fact in France, and fearing their tyranny. John Knox (he continued) is now so feeble as scarce can he stand alone, or speak to be heard of any audience, yet doth he every Sunday cause himself to be carried to a place, where a certain number do hear him, and preacheth with the same vehemency and zeal that ever he did. He doth reverence your lordship much, and willed me once again to send you word, that he thanked God he had obtained at his hands, that the gospel of Jesus Christ is truly and simply preached through Scotland, which doth so comfort him, as now he desireth to be out of this miserable life. He further said, that it was not of your lordships² that he was not a great bishop in England, but the effect grown in Scotland he being

¹ MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Edinburgh, 29 September, 1572. Killigrew to Burghley and Leicester.

² The meaning is, I think, "that it was from no fault of your lordships." That is of Burghley.

an instrument, doth much more satisfy him. He desired me to make his last commendations most humbly unto your lordship, and withall that, he prayed God to increase his strong spirit in you, saying, that there was never more need."¹

It was no doubt by Knox's advice that proclamation was made on the 3d of October for a convention of the "professors of the true religion" to consult upon the dangers resulting from the conspiracies of the Papists. To the sheet on which it was printed, there were added certain heads or articles, said to be extracts from the secret contract between the pope, the emperor, and the kings of Spain and Portugal, for the extirpation of the Protestant faith,² and Killigrew believed that all these preliminaries would prepare the mind of the people for any extremities that might be used against their unhappy sovereign.

Meanwhile his tool, the Abbot of Dumfermling was secretly trafficking with Morton and the Regent, and so far succeeded, that on the 9th of October a conference on the proposed execution of Mary was held at Dalkeith, in Morton's bed chamber, he being still confined by sickness. None were present but the Regent, Mar, and Killigrew, who immediately communicated the result to Cecil and Leicester in the following letter:

¹ MS. Letter, Brit. Mus. Caligula, C. iii. f. 370, Oct. 6. Killigrew to Burghley and Leicester.

² Broadside, St. P. Off. entitled "Proclamation for a convention of the professors of the true religion." 3d October, 1572. Printed by Lekprevick at St. Andrew's. A.D. 1572.

“ My singular good Lords—What has past here since my last touching the common cause, I have written to Mr. Secretary at length.

“ *Now for the great matter ye wot of.* At my being at Dalkeith with my Lord Regent's grace, the Earl of Morton and he had conference, and both willing to do the thing you most desire—howbeit I could have no answer there, but that both thought it the only way and the best way to end all troubles, as it were, in both realms. They told me, notwithstanding, the matter was dangerous, and might come so to pass, as they should draw war upon their heads, and in that case, or rather to stop that peril, they would desire her Majesty should enter in league defensive, comprehending therein the cause of religion also.

“ We came (he continued) to nearer terms, to wit, that her Majesty should, for a certain time, pay the sum that her Highness bestoweth for the keeping of her in England, to the preservation of this Crown, and take the protection of the young king. All this I heard, and said, If they thought it not profitable for them, and that if they meant not to will me to write earnestly as their desire, I would not move my pen for the matter; whereat the Earl of Morton raised himself in his bed, and said, that both my Lord Regent and he, did desire it as a sovereign salve for all their sores, howbeit it could not be done without some manner of ceremony, and a kind of process, whereunto the noblemen must be called after a secret manner, and

the clergy likewise, which would ask some time. Also that it would be requisite her Majesty should send such a convoy with the party, that in case there were people would not like of it, they might be able to keep the field; adding farther, that if they can bring the nobility to consent, as they hope they shall, they will not keep the prisoner three hours alive, after he come into the bounds of Scotland.¹ But I, leaving of these devices, desired to know, indeed, what they would have me write, and it was answered, that I should know farther of my Lord Regent's grace here, so as this morning, a little before dinner, going to take my leave of him, as he was going towards Stirling, he told me, touching that matter, which was communed upon at Dalkeith, he found it very good, and the best remedy for all diseases, and willed me so to write unto your honours, nevertheless that it was of great weight, and therefore he would advise him of the form and manner how it might best be brought to pass, and that known, he would confer more at length with me in the same. Thus took I my leave of him, and find him indeed more cold than Morton, and yet seemed glad, and desirous to have it come to pass."²

Killigrew proceeded to say, in the same letter, that some were of opinion the Queen could not be executed without the meeting of Parliament, which

¹ Sic in Orig.

² MS. Letter, Caligula, C. iii. 373, 374. Killigrew to Burghley and Leicester, 9th Oct. 1572.

might be called suddenly, and under pretence of some other business. The reason assigned was, that the Scottish Queen had only been condemned as worthy of deposition on the ground of her accession to the murder of her husband; she had not yet been judged to die.¹ This proposition met with no encouragement from the English envoy; a clear proof that a secret and speedy death was the object desired by Elizabeth. The proposal was, as he hinted, an excuse to delay time, and to agree to it, would have been to act contrary to his instructions. The conclusion of his letter I must give in his own words:—

“ Although there be, that do assure me that the regent hath, after a sort, moved this matter to nine of the best of their party, to wit, that it were fit to make a humble request to the Queen’s Majesty, to have hither the cause of all their troubles, and to do, *etc.*, who have consented to him, and that I am also borne in hand, that both he and the Earl of Morton do, by all dexterity, proceed in the furtherance thereof, yet can I not assure myself of any thing, because I see them so inconstant, so divided * * *. I am also told, that the hostages have been talked of, and that they shall be delivered to our men upon the fields, and the matter dispatched within four hours, so as they shall not need to tarry long in our hands, but I like not their manner of dealing, and therefore leave it to

¹ MS. Letter, Brit. Mus. Caligula, C. iii. f. 374, 375. Kiligrew to Lords Burghley and Leicester, Oct. 9th 1572.

your wisdom to consider if you will have me continue to give ear, and advertise [if] I shall: if not, I pray your lordships let me be called hence.¹

In this last sentence it is impossible not to see that the emphatic “to do et cetera;” the delivery of the Scottish hostages for the performance of the agreement upon the fields, and the “dispatching the matter,” that is having the queen put to death, “within four hours,” all show that both the regent and Morton had given their full consent to the proposal. Measures were to be taken to have the sentence pronounced (if indeed any ceremony of a sentence was seriously contemplated) and the execution hurried over with the utmost expedition and economy; and the only cause of delay on the part of the regent and his brother earl, was the selfish wish of making the most profit of this cruel bargain.

Four days after this, on the 13th of October, Killigrew sent another secret packet to Leicester and Burghley. He had again been at Dalkeith, and found not only Morton “very hot and earnestly bent in the matter,” but “the two ministers” equally eager in the business. From the cautious manner in which the English envoy wrote, the names of these two ministers are suppressed, and in such a case conjecture is unsatisfactory. We know that Mr. Nicholas Elphinston, and Pitcairn, the Abbot of Dumfermling, were the instruments already employed by Morton and Killigrew, in this dark negotiation,

¹ MS. Letter, Brit. Mus. Caligula, C. iii. fol. 375, Killigrew to Burghley and Leicester, October 9th, 1572.

and it is possible that they are here meant. Two other facts also are certain, from a letter of the English envoy, the one that Cecil had enjoined him to avail himself of the co-operation of the Kirk in accomplishing the objects of his negotiation, the other that he had already consulted John Knox, who, even in "extreme debility," and as he describes it, "with one foot in the grave," was, in mind, as active as ever. From a letter already quoted, we have seen his convictions of Mary's guilt, and wishes for her execution, he may therefore have been one of the ministers to whom allusion was made. But this is speculation; and, after all, it might be argued, that from the words of Killigrew, the matter he spoke of to Knox was not the execution of Mary, as the former private interview may have solely related to the best method of exciting the people against France and the Romish faction in Scotland.

However this may be, the English ambassador was informed by Morton, that if Mar showed coldness, or delayed to execute the matter, it should be done without him, and he added, that as he was Lieutenant-general of the whole kingdom on this side Tay, he had power to carry it into execution.¹ He hinted, however, that if Elizabeth hoped to gain this great object, she must be more cordial in her support, and more generous in her advances. Her refusal to assist them and her

¹ MS. Letter, Brit. Mus. Caligula, C. iii. f. 376. Killigrew to Burghley and Leicester, 13th Oct. 1572.

coldness had already, he said, alienated some hearts, though not his. To this Killigrew shrewdly replied, that if Morton could, at this moment, have given some good assurance, that Mary should be executed, or, as he expressed it in his dark language, for the performance “of *the great matter*,” then he might safely reckon on the Queen of England for the satisfying his desires: but he must recollect, that its accomplishment was the sole ground on which a defensive league between the two countries could be negociated. Without it “a man could promise nothing.”¹

From the ambassador's next letter, however, any anticipated coldness or disinclination on the part of Mar appears to have entirely vanished. It was written from Stirling, and informed Burghley and Leicester, that the regent, after some general observations on the subject of the peace, began to speak, “touching the great matter, wherein,” said he, “I found him very earnest.” “He had sent,” he said, “his resolute mind to the Lord Morton by the Abbot, and desired him (Killigrew) to write speedily to Burghley and Leicester, that they might further the same by all possible means, as the only salve for the cure of the great sores of the commonwealth.” I perceive,” added Killigrew, “that the regent's first coldness grew rather for want of skill how to compass so great a matter, than for lack of good will to execute the same. He desired me also to write unto your honours to

¹ MS. Letter, Brit. Mus. Caligula, C. iii, f. 376. Killigrew to Burghley and Leicester, 13th Oct. 1572.

be suitors unto your majesty for some relief of money towards the payment of his soldiers.”¹

It is very striking, that in the midst of these dark practices, and when he had not only consented to Mary's death, but pressed that it should be speedy, Mar was himself struck with mortal sickness, and died at Stirling, (on the 28th of October) within ten days after his interview with the English ambassador.² Previous to this event, however, he and Morton had sent to Killigrew by the Abbot of Dumfermling, the conditions on which they were ready to rid Elizabeth of her rival. They stipulated that the queen of England should take the young king their sovereign under her protection; they demanded a declaration from the English parliament, that his rights should not be prejudged by any sentence or process against his mother; they required that there should be a defensive league between England and Scotland: and that the Earls of Huntingdon, Bedford, or Essex, accompanied with two or three thousand of her majesty's men of war, should assist at the execution. These troops were afterwards to join the young king's forces in reducing the Castle of Edinburgh. This fortress, when recovered from the enemy, was to be delivered to the regent, and all arrears then due to the Scottish forces were to be paid by England.

¹ MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Killigrew to Burghley and Leicester, 19 October, 1572, Stirling.

² See Proofs and Illustrations, letter of Killigrew on the death of Mar.

With these conditions Killigrew was grievously disappointed. He instantly, however, sent them by Captain Arrington, a confidential messenger, to Burghley, accompanied by a letter, in which he mentioned Mar's extreme danger, but gave some little hope of life. At the moment, however, when this was written at Edinburgh, the regent had expired at Stirling, and Burghley received the account of his death, and the "Articles of agreement, touching the great matter" almost at the same instant. Although commonly of a calm and collected temper, his agitation on the present occasion seems to have been extreme. The articles themselves were such as he had little expected, the price of blood demanded by the Scottish earls was unreasonably high ; and he felt indignant at Killigrew, that he should ever have received such proposals ; but even if it had not been so, the death of Mar rendered it impossible to carry them into execution with the speed the necessity required ; and he immediately wrote to Leicester, informing him of the total failure of their Scottish project, and emphatically remarking, that the queen must now fall back upon her last resource for the safety of herself and her kingdom. What this was, he shrunk from stating in express words ; but he knew that Leicester could supply them, and there is not the slightest doubt that he alluded to the execution of Mary in England. His letter, however, is too characteristic to be omitted. It is wholly in his own hand.

“ My Lord,—This bearer came to me an hour and-a-h (alf) after your departure. The letters which he brought me are here included. I now see the Queen’s Majesty hath no surety but as she hath been counselled, for this way that was meant for dealing with Scotland is, you may see, neither now possible, nor was by their articles made reasonable. If her majesty will continue her delays, for providing for her own surety by just means given to her by God, she and we all shall vainly call upon God when the calamity shall fall upon us. God send her majesty strength of spirit to preserve God’s cause, her own life and the lives of millions of good subjects, all which are most manifestly in danger; and that only by her delays, and so consequently she shall be the cause of the overthrow of a noble Crown and realm, which shall be a prey to all that can invade it, God be merciful to us.”¹

Thus was Burghley and Leicester’s project for Mary’s secret execution by the hands of her own subjects destroyed by the death of Mar, at the moment he had consented to it; and the scheme which these cruel and unscrupulous politicians conceived themselves to have so deeply laid, on which they pondered as Cecil owned, “daily and almost hourly,” entirely discomfited and cast to the winds.

Mary in the meantime was herself unconscious of the danger she had escaped; and indeed it is worthy of observation, that so well had the English

¹ MS. Letter, Brit. Mus. Caligula, C. iii. fol. 386, Burghley to Leicester, 8 November, 1572.

ambassador kept his counsel, and so true were the conspirators to their secret, that after a concealment of nearly three centuries, these dark intrigues, with all their ramifications, have now for the first time been made a portion of our national history.¹ Another base transaction stains the history of this year. During Morton's exile in England the Earl of Northumberland had been his kindest friend. Northumberland himself was now a captive in Scotland, under the charge of Morton—but instead of a return of benefits, this base and avaricious man sold his unhappy prisoner to Elizabeth, who shortly after had him executed at York.²

¹ Dr. Robertson, not having access to the St. P. Off. had not seen the letters of Killigrew and Burghley, which unveil this part of Mary's history. He consequently falls into the error of stating, that Mar, from his honorable feelings, instantly rejected Killigrew's proposal of bringing Mary to her trial in Scotland, pronouncing her guilty, and executing her. All subsequent historians, amongst the rest the acute and learned Lingard, have been misled by this view of the transaction. Killigrew's and Burghley's Letters have at length given us the truth. No trial, it appears to me, was ever contemplated—and Mar, though at first cold in the matter, at last, gave his full consent to Mary's being put to death as speedily and secretly as possible.

² MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Hunsdon to Burghley, 1st May, 1572. Ibid. Mar to Hunsdon, 23 May, 1572. Also Ibid. Hunsdon to Burghley, 29 May, 1572.—Camden, p. 445. Gonzalez, p. 376.

CHAP. V.

1572 - 1574.

Regency of Morton.

CONTEMPORARY SOVEREIGNS.

<i>England.</i>	<i>France.</i>	<i>Germany.</i>	<i>Spain.</i>	<i>Portugal.</i>	<i>Pope.</i>
Elizabeth.	Charles IX.	Maximilian II.	Philip II.	Sebastian.	Pius VI.

THE death of Mar, over which there hung some suspicion of poison, threw Killigrew, the English ambassador, into much perplexity,¹ and Burghley, who had received the news as early as the 3d of November, wrote on that day to Walsingham, the English ambassador at the French court, in much anxiety. "The 29th of the last," said he, "the good regent of Scotland is dead, as I think by a natural sickness, and yet the certainty is not known. This will make our causes the worse in Scotland, for I fear the conveyance away of the king; and yet there is care taken for his surety, but I can almost hope for no good, seeing our evils fall by heaps, and why the heaps fall not upon ourselves

¹ MS. Letter, Caligula, B. viii. f. 302. Killigrew to Leicester, begun 28th Oct. finished 31st. Oct. 1572.

personally, I see no cause to the let thereof in ourselves. God be merciful to us * *.”¹

Elizabeth, who felt the importance of the event, and dreaded the success of French money and intrigues in Scotland, lost not a moment in taking measures to preserve her party. She wrote to the Countess of Mar, recommending her to watch over the safety of the young prince, her dear relative, in whose welfare she took the deepest interest, and she sent a flattering letter to the Earl of Morton, in which with unusual condescension, she addressed him as if already regent, calling him her well-beloved cousin, commending the wisdom with which he had governed himself in times past in seasons of great difficulty, and expressing her hope that he and the nobility would take measures for the safety of the young king, and the repose of the realm. For more particulars she referred him to Killigrew, her ambassador, and alluding to the necessity of appointing a new regent, trusted that the election would not disturb the quiet of the country.²

These were politic steps, as Morton was undoubtedly at this time the most able and powerful of the nobility. Even under Mar he had regulated every public measure, and when it was certain that the regent was on his death bed, the whole administration of affairs seems naturally to have devolved

¹ MS. Letter, *Vespasian F. vi.* fol. 181 d. Burghley to Walsingham, 3 Nov. 1572.

² Copy, St. P. Off. 4th Nov. 1572. Elizabeth to Morton.

on him.¹ He was supported by the great majority of the nobles, by the influential party of the church, and by the friendship of England. Against such influence the Castilians and their friends could do little, and after a feeble opposition, he was chosen Regent in a parliament held at Edinburgh on the 24th of November, and proclaimed next day with the usual solemnity.²

At this parliament Elizabeth's letters to the Scottish nobility were publicly read, and although these were not so decided in their language as her partizans had desired, there can be little doubt that the knowledge of her favour to Morton produced the greatest influence. On informing his royal mistress and her minister Burghley of the late events, Killigrew earnestly advised some more effectual assistance to be sent to the new Regent. He had in vain endeavoured to induce the two factions to refer their controversies to Elizabeth. The Castilians were still confident in the strength of their fortress, and looked to speedy aid from France; Morton on the other hand, although he admitted the desirableness of peace, had invariably asserted, that to storm the castle and utterly subdue the king's enemies would be the only means to establish a firm government, and restore

¹ MS. Letter, Caligula, B. viii. fol. 300. Killigrew to Burghley, and Leicester, 29 6th Oct. 1572.

² Copy, St. P. Off. Killigrew to the Queen, 2 Dec. 1572. See MS. Letter, St. P. Off. 19 Nov. 1572. Noblemen, and others, met at the convention in Edinburgh.

security alike to Scotland and England. But it was evident that this could not be done without some effectual assistance. The regent and the nobles were too poor to maintain any sufficient body of troops on their own resources, and the danger seemed to be, that if not supported by Elizabeth, they would look to France.

“This regent,” said Killigrew, in his letter to Burghley, “is a shrewd fellow, and I fear little Douglas be not come home out of France without some offers to him among others, howbeit hitherto I can perceive nothing at all, for he assureth me still to run the course of England as much as ever regent did. Notwithstanding I see not how he can make war till the parliament be ended, tho he had aid of money, and that for two reasons. The one the parliament is appointed in this town, which cannot well be holden because of the castle if it were war, and the parliament must of necessity be holden for many weighty reasons. The other is the regent’s indisposition, as he is not like to travel for a month or two, but rather to keep his bed or chamber under the surgeon’s care for a disease that hath much troubled him this five or six years.”¹

A few days after the dispatch of this letter, Killigrew made a rapid journey to Berwick to hold a conference with Sir William Drury on Scottish matters, and obtain his advice and assistance. He was recalled suddenly, however, to Edinburgh, by

¹ MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Killigrew to Burghley, Dec. 10th, 1572. Edin.

a report of Morton's extreme danger, but found him much recovered, and soon after had the satisfaction of receiving an assurance from England that the queen had determined to give effective support to the new regent both in money and troops.¹ Of the money, part was instantly paid down, and, by Elizabeth's directions, two skilful engineers, Johnson and Fleming, repaired to Edinburgh and examined the strength of the castle. They reported, that with a proper force and battering trains it might be taken in twenty days, and it was resolved, as soon as the season of the year permitted, to begin the siege.

It was in the midst of these transactions, and on the very day on which Morton was chosen regent, that the celebrated reformer Knox died, in his house at Edinburgh.² He was scarcely to be called an aged man, not having completed his sixty-seventh year, but his life had been an incessant scene of theological and political warfare, and his ardent and restless intellect had worn out a frame which at no period had been a strong one.

There is perhaps no juster test of a great man, than the impression which he has left, or the changes he has wrought, upon his age, and under

¹ MS. Letter, St. P. Off. B. C. Sir William Drury to Burghley, 21st Dec. 1572. Great secrecy was to be used in the delivery of the money to Morton. The sum was 2,500*l.*, to be defrayed in extraordinary causes. Orig. St. P. Off. B. C. Sir Valentine Brown to Lord Burghley, 26th Dec, 1572.

² Bannatyne's Memorials, p. 280.

this view, none is more entitled to this appellation than Knox, who has been deservedly regarded as the father of the Reformation in Scotland. The history of his life is indeed little else than the history of this great religious revolution, and none can deny him the praise of courage, integrity, and indefatigable exertion in proclaiming that system of truth which he believed to be founded upon the word of God. To this he was faithful to the last, and although it appears to me, that on many occasions he acted upon the principle, (so manifestly erroneous and anti-christian), that the end justified the means, on no one occasion do we find him influenced by selfish or venal motives. In this respect he stands alone, and pre-eminent over all the men with whom he laboured. To extirpate a system which in its every part he believed to be false and idolatrous, and to replace it by another, of which he was as firmly persuaded that it was the work of God, seem to have been the master passion of his mind. In the accomplishment of this, none who has studied the history of the times, or his own writings, will deny, that he was often fierce, unrelenting, and unscrupulous, but he was also disinterested, upright, and sincere. He neither feared nor flattered the great; the pomp of the mitre or the revenues of the wealthiest diocese, had no attractions in his eyes, and there cannot be a doubt of his sincerity, when in his last message to his old and long-tried friend Lord Burghley, he assured him that he counted it higher

honour to have been made the instrument that the Gospel was simply and truly preached in his native country, than to have been the highest prelate in England.

During his last illness, his time was wholly occupied in offices of devotion, and in receiving the visits of a few religious friends, who affectionately assisted his family in the attendance which his feeble and helpless condition required. A few days before his death, he sent for Mr. David Lindsay, Mr. James Lawson, and the elders and deacons of the church,¹ and raising himself in his bed, addressed them in these solemn words: "The time is approaching for which I have long thirsted, wherein I shall be relieved of all cares, and be with my Saviour Christ for ever. And now God is my witness, whom I have served with my spirit, in the Gospel of his Son, that I have taught nothing but the true and solid doctrine of the Gospel, and that the end I proposed in all my preaching, was to instruct the ignorant, to confirm the weak, to comfort the consciences of those who were humbled under the sense of their sins, and bear down with the threatenings of God's judgments such as were proud and rebellious. I am not ignorant that many have blamed, and yet do blame, my too great rigour and severity, but God knows that in my heart I never hated the persons of those against whom I thundered God's judgments. I did only hate their sins, and laboured at all my power to

¹ Bannatyne's Memorials, p. 264, 283.

gain them to Christ. That I forbore none of whatsoever condition, I did it out of the fear of my God, who had placed me in the function of the ministry, and I knew would bring me to an account. Now, brethren, for yourselves, I have no more to say, but that you take heed to the flock over whom God hath placed you overseers, and whom he hath redeemed by the blood of his only begotten son. And you, Mr. Lawson (this was his successor), fight a good fight. Do the work of the Lord with courage and with a willing mind, and God from above bless you and the church whereof you have the charge. Against it, so long as it continueth in the doctrine of truth, the gates of hell shall not prevail.”¹

During his illness, he continued to exhibit all his wonted interest in public affairs, often bewailed the defection of Grange, one of his oldest friends, and sent a message to him which at the time was regarded as almost prophetic. “Go,” said he, addressing Lindsay the minister of Leith, “to yonder man in the castle, whom you know I have loved so dearly, and tell him that I have sent you yet once more to warn him, in the name of God, to leave that evil cause. * * * Neither the craggy rock in which he miserably confides, nor the carnal prudence of that man (meaning the secretary Lethington) whom he esteems a demi-god, nor the assistance of strangers shall preserve him, but he shall

¹ Spottiswood, p. 265, 266. Bannatynes’s Memorials, p. 283.

be disgracefully dragged from his nest to punishment, and hung on a gallows against the face of the sun, unless he speedily amend his life and flee to the mercy of God.”¹

It appears to me, that in this and other similar predictions, the dying reformer, who was not only intimately acquainted with, but personally engaged in the secret correspondence between his party and England, availed himself of this knowledge to fulminate his threats and warnings, which he knew the advance of the English army was so soon likely to fulfil.

During this time his weakness rapidly increased, and on Friday the 21st of November he desired his coffin to be made. The succeeding Saturday and Sunday were spent by him almost uninterruptedly in meditation and prayer, in pious ejaculations, and earnest advices addressed to his family and friends. On Monday the 24th these sacred exercises were resumed till he was exhausted and fell into a slumber from which he awoke to have the evening prayers read to him. “About eleven o’clock (I use the words of his excellent biographer) he gave a deep sigh, and said, ‘now, it is come,’ upon which Richard Bannatyne; his faithful servant and secretary, drew near, and desired him to think of those comfortable promises of our Saviour Christ which he had so often declared to others; and perceiving that he was speechless, requested him to give them a sign that he heard them and died in peace.

¹ Macrie’s Life, by Crichton, pp. 300, 302. Melvil’s Diary, p. 27.

Upon this he lifted up one of his hands, and sighing twice, expired without a struggle.”¹

The death of Knox was followed by the complete recovery of Morton and the renewal of the war after a vain attempt to prolong the abstinence.² But although hostilities re-commenced, a parliament assembled in the capital, the house where it met being protected from the fire of the castle by a bulwark, and in this, after the election of the regent had been confirmed by the three estates, all measures adopted since the coronation of the young king were ratified, and every proceeding conducted in the name of the captive queen declared invalid and treasonable. Measures also were taken to urge forward a reconciliation between the regent and such of the nobility as had not yet acceded to his government. Of these the greatest were the Duke of Chastelherault, the whole of the Hamiltons, Argile, Huntly, and his gallant brother Sir Adam Gordon, who still maintained his ascendancy in the north. With a view to facilitate an accommodation, it was secretly resolved that for the present no enquiry into the murder of the late king should take place, nor any prosecution be instituted against such persons as were suspected of this crime. The regent was also empowered to pardon all persons accessory to the death of the Earl of Lennox.

¹ Macrie's Life, by Crichton, p. 309. Bannatyne, p. 289.

² MS. Letter, St. P. Off. 1st January, 1572-3. Killigrew to Burghley.

The object of all this was quite apparent. Morton himself, Huntly, Argile, and Sir James Balfour, (who had lately deserted his friends in the castle) were all of them concerned in the murder of Darnley, whilst the assassination of Lennox the late regent was as certainly the work of the Hamiltons. Any resolution to prosecute the perpetrators of either crime, must have at once put an end to the hopes of a reconciliation, and it was determined for the present to say and do nothing upon either subject.¹

During the first sitting of the parliament Killigrew was absent at Berwick, whither he had gone for the purpose of consulting with Sir William Drury and expediting the preparations for the approaching siege of the castle. Before his departure, however, he had a meeting with Nicholas Elphinston on the "great matter," or to speak more plainly, the secret project for having Mary executed—a subject which, although interrupted by Mary's decease, appears to have been resumed on the election of Morton. It seemed, however, that this dark design of Elizabeth, by which she hoped to rid herself of her enemy without her hand appearing in the transaction, was invariably destined to be thwarted. We have just seen, that, for the security of Huntly, Argile, and the regent himself, it had been resolved to accuse no person of

¹ MS. Letter, St. P. Off. 26th Jan. 1572-3. Notes and titles of Acts as were passed in the parliament began at Edinburgh 15th Jan. 1572.

the murder, and the same prudent considerations made it expedient, at this moment, to say and do nothing against the queen. In a letter addressed at this time by Elphinston to Killigrew, this is clearly explained. "The other matter," said he, "I doubt not, you know perfectly well, cannot nor may not at this time be touched, because presently the murder may not be spoken of, seeing some suspected thereof to be in terms of appointment, as I shall at meeting cause you more clearly to understand ; but of this matter I trust hereafter shortly to see a good beginning."¹

In this parliament a conference took place between the Kirk and certain commissioners appointed by the three estates, in which an important ecclesiastical measure was carried. This was the confirmation of that order for the election of bishops, which had been drawn up in the Book of Discipline devised at Leith many years before. The change amounted to nothing less than the establishment of episcopacy in the Scottish Church. It was decided, that the title and office of Archbishop and Bishop should be continued as in the time which preceded the Reformation, and that a spiritual jurisdiction should be exercised by the bishops in their respective dioceses. It was determined that all abbots, priors, and other inferior prelates who were presented to benefices should be tried by the bishop or superin-

¹ MS. Letter, St. P. Off. N. Elphinston to Killigrew, 17th Jan., 1572-3.

tendent of the diocese concerning their fitness to represent the church in parliament, and that to such bishoprics as were presently void, or which should become vacant, the king and regent should take care to recommend qualified persons, whose election should be made by the chapters of their cathedral churches. It was also ordered, that all benefices with cure under prelacies, should be disposed of to ministers who should receive ordination from the bishop of the diocese, upon their taking an oath to recognise the authority of the king, and to pay canonical obedience to their ordinary.¹

In the midst of these proceedings Killigrew returned to Edinburgh, and on the succeeding day was admitted to an audience of the parliament. The message which he delivered, and the assurances he conveyed of the determination of his royal mistress to protect the young king and support the government of the regent, produced an immediate effect, and a convention for a general pacification was soon after held at Perth, between commissioners appointed by the regent on the one

¹ Spottiswood, p. 260.

Mr. David Lindsay, a minister and commissioner, communicated these important measures to Killigrew in a letter written during the sitting of the Conference, and when the guns of the castle were thundering in their ears. Its concluding sentence is worthy of notice, as it seems to show that Killigrew had still in view such measures as he judged necessary for the prosecution of the "great matter" confided to him. "The article which your Lordship desired me to remember, touching the murder, is not

side, and Huntly and the Lord of Arbroath as the representative of the Duke of Chastelherault on the other. It was attended by the English ambassador, in whose lodging the conferences took place, and who exerted himself so successfully to compose all subjects of difference, that at last a complete reconciliation was effected. "And now," said the successful diplomatist to Lord Burghley, "there remaineth but the castle to make the king universally obeyed, and this realm united, which peradventure may be done without force after the accord; notwithstanding, in my simple opinion, which I submit unto your honour's wisdom, it standeth with more reason and policy for her Majesty to hasten the aid rather now than before this conference. I mean, so that it may be ready, if need require, to execute—otherwise not.¹

At this moment the fortunes of the Castilians (so Grange and the Queen's party were called) seemed reduced to the lowest ebb, and disaster after disaster threatened to bring total ruin upon their cause. Verac, who had been commissioned to bring them relief from the French king, was driven by a tempest into Scarborough, and detained in Eng-

like to pass, lest it should hold back some that are willing to come to composition. I cannot tell how long the parliament shall last, but I suppose all will be ended this next Wednesday at the farthest. This day the castle has declared their ill will with great shooting and little harm." * * * MS. Letter, St. P. Off. David Lindsay, to Mr. Killigrew, Leith, 16th Jan. 1572-3.

¹ MS. Letter, St. P. Off. 18th Feb. 1572, Killigrew to Burghley.

land. Sir James Kirkaldy, Grange's brother, who had landed at the Castle of Blackness, with a large supply of money, arms, and military stores, was betrayed and seized, whilst the castle itself fell into the hands of the regent;¹ the example of Huntly and the Hamiltons, in acceding to the king's authority, was speedily followed by the submission of the Lords Gray, Oliphant, the Sheriff of Ayr, and the Lairds of Buccleugh and Johnston; whilst in the north Huntly undertook to bring over to terms his gallant brother, Sir Adam Gordon, who, during the conferences at Perth, had surprised and routed the king's adherents at Aberdeen. With this view the indefatigable Killigrew had hurried from Perth to the capital, where he obtained the regent's signature to the articles of pacification.²

Even, under all these gloomy appearances, the spirit of Grange was unbroken, and the resources of Lethington undiminished. A long experience of the parsimony of Elizabeth had persuaded them that she would never submit to the expence of sending an army and a battering train into Scotland. They looked with confidence to the arrival of assistance from France, and trusted that even

¹ History of James the Sext, p. 127. It was betrayed to the enemy by the treachery of the wife of Sir James Kirkaldy.

² MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Killigrew to Burghley, 23rd Feb. 1572-3. "God so blessed this treaty, as this day, being the 23rd aforenoon, the Articles of Accord and Pacification were signed."

if long delayed, the strength of their walls would still bid defiance to the enemy.¹

For a brief season these sanguine anticipations seemed to be realised, and the Queen of England, at the moment when Burghley imagined he had convinced her of the necessity of sending her forces into Scotland, began to waver. She dreaded bringing on a war with France, represented to her Council the great expence and hazard of the siege, and asserted that Morton ought to be able to reduce it without her assistance. Killigrew was in despair. He wrote instantly, that if the expedition were abandoned, Scotland would be lost to them, and as surely united in a league with France. Every thing, he contended, proved this. Lord Seaton had been already negotiating with the regent to win him to France. What had been Verac's late commission? To corrupt the garrison of Dumbarton, to bribe the governors of the young king, and to convey him out of Scotland. What was Stephen Wilson's message out of France, when he was lately seized, and his letters to the captain of the Castle of Edinburgh intercepted? Did he not bring assurances from the French king and the Bishop of Glasgow, Mary's ambassador in Paris, and had he not confessed the Pope's designs, and that of the rest of the Romish league, to be mainly directed against England and Scotland. Nay,

¹ Copy of the time, St. P. Off. 23 Feb. 1572-3. Lord of Lethington and Grange to the Earl of Huntly.

were not the papal coffers already unlocked, and the man's name known who was shortly to bring the money, and begin the attack? And would her Majesty shut her eyes to all this, and this too at the very crisis when a decided effort, and no very great sum, might enable her to confound these plans and secure her ground in Scotland? Would she countermand her army, and abandon the advantages which were within her reach, or rather which she had already secured? "If so," said the ambassador, in the end of an eloquent letter to Burghley, "God's will be done. For mine own part, if this castle be not recovered, and that with expedition, I see, methinks, the beginning of sorrows, and her Majesty's peaceable reign hitherto decaying, as it were in post, which God of his mercy defend. The reasons be so apparent, as I need not to trouble your honour with them, whose shoulders, next her Majesty's, shall not carry the least burthen, and therefore I pray God send you strength to overcome."¹

These arguments produced the desired effect, Elizabeth's parsimonious fears gave way under the alarming arguments of her ambassador, and orders were dispatched to Sir W. Drury, who had been chosen to command the enterprise, to have every thing in readiness for the march of the army and the transport of the cannon at a moment's notice. A last attempt to bring the Castilians to terms was

¹ MS. Letter, St. P. Off. 9 March, 1572-3. Killigrew to Burghley.

now made by the Earl of Rothes, but it led to no result. Kirkaldy and Lethington declared that though deserted by all their friends, they would keep the castle to the last, and on the 25th of April, the English army, consisting of five hundred hakbutters, and a hundred and forty pikemen, entered the capital. They were joined by seven hundred soldiers of the regent, and the battering train having at the same time arrived by sea, the operations of the siege commenced.

In the midst of these martial transactions, the regent assembled a parliament, which confirmed the league with England, ratified the late pacification, restored Huntly and Sir James Balfour to their estates and honours, and pronounced a sentence of treason and forfeiture against the Castilians. A summons of surrender was then sent to Grange in the name of Morton and of the English general,¹ and operations for the undermining the "Spur," or Blockhouse, and erecting the batteries on the principal spots which commanded the walls, proceeded with little interruption from the besieged. Their obstinacy, indeed, was surprising, and can only be accounted for by the extraordinary influence which Lethington possessed, and his fatal conviction that succours would yet arrive from France. His power over Kirkaldy was described by Killi-

¹ Copy, St. P. Off. 25 April, 1573. Sir W. Drury's Summons. Also Ibid. The Regent's Summons. MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Killigrew to Burghley, 27 April, 1573. Also MS. Ibid. Acts of the Parliament, 30th April, 1573.

grew as something like enchantment ; and although Robert Melvil, Pitadrow, and other leading men, would fain have come to terms, though they argued that their powder and ammunition were exhausted, their victuals and supply of water on the point of failing, and their distress increasing every moment, still the governor declared he would hold the castle till he was buried in its ruins.

On the 2nd of May Killigrew, who himself assisted in the trenches, wrote thus to Burghley. "Yesterday I did advertise your honour of the end of the parliament. This day Sir Henry Ley, with his company dined with the Regent, and upon Monday, the 4th of this month, the general doth intend to begin to plant his batteries. They within make good show, and fortify continually to frustrate the first battery, although the Regent and others here be of opinion, that they will never abide the extremity. Their water will soon be taken from them when the ordnance shall be laid both within and without. Hope of succour there is none, and therefore their obstinacy must needs be vain. I send your lordship the roll of their names within, both tag and rag, and as I am informed, eighteen of the best of them would fain be out."¹ All such hopes of escape, however, were now utterly vain, for Drury perceived his advantage, and Morton had determined to receive nothing but an unconditional surrender. In England the result of the

¹ MS. Letter, St. P. Off. 2d May, 1573. Killigrew to Burghley.

siege was regarded with deep interest, and many young cavaliers, amongst whom was Thomas Cecil, Burghley's eldest son, repaired from the English court to join the army and work in the trenches.

On the 17th of May the batteries were completed, and, beginning to play upon the principal bastion, named David's Tower, were answered by a long and loud shriek from the women in the castle, which was distinctly heard in the English camp. "This day" (17th May) said Killigrew in one of his journal letters to Burghley, "at one of the clock in the afternoon, some of our pieces began to speak such language as it made both them in the castle I am sure, think more of God than they did before, and all our men and a great many others, think the enterprise not so hard as before they took it to be. * * I trust, to be short, that after the battery shall be outlaid, which as they say will be ready by the 21st of this month, the matter will be at a point, 'before the end of the same, * * thanks be to God although it be longsome, it hath hitherto been with the least blood that ever was heard in such a case, and this conjecture we have to lead us, that they want store of powder within, for they have suffered us to plant all the ordnance, and to shoot yesterday all the afternoon without any harm from them. * *"

From this time till the twenty-third, the cannon

¹ MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Edin. Killigrew to Burghley, 17th May, 1573. Also Drury to Burghley, 18 May 1573. "After the first tyre of ordnance great cries and shouts was made by the women of the castle, terming the day and hour black."

played incessantly upon the castle, the guns of the garrison were silenced, and in the afternoon of that day the southern wall of David's Tower fell, with a great crash; next day its east quarter, the portcullis and an outer bastion named Wallace Tower, were beaten down; and on the 26th the English, with little resistance, stormed the "Spur" or Blockhouse.¹ Preparations were now made for a general assault; and Morton, who had determined to lead the Scottish forces, was exulting in the near prospect of laying hands upon his victims, when to his mortification Grange presented himself on the wall with a white rod in his hand, and obtained from his old friend and fellow soldier Drury, an abstinence of two days, preparatory to a surrender. This was in the evening, and a meeting immediately took place between Grange and Robert Melvil, on the part of the Castilians, Killigrew and Drury for the queen of England, and Lord Boyd for the regent. Kirkaldy's requests were, to have surety for their lives and livings, not be spoiled of their goods within the castle, to have license for Lord Hume and Lethington to retire into England, and himself to be allowed to remain unmolested in his own country.²

To these conditions Drury would probably have

¹ MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Drury to Burghley, 28 May, 1573.

² MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Killigrew to Burghley, 27 May, 1573. Also Ibid. Orig. Sir W. Drury to Burghley, 28 May, 1572, in which Drury says, "I will not harken unto the request of the Castilians, further than the regent and our ambassador shall allow of."

agreed, but they were scornfully rejected by Morton. As to the great body of the garrison, he said, he was ready if they came out singly without arms, and submitted to his mercy, to grant them their lives, and permit them to go where they pleased; but there were nine persons who must be excepted from these conditions, Grange himself, William Maitland of Lethington the secretary, Alexander Lord Hume, Robert Melvil of Murdocairny, the Bishop of Dunkeld, and the Lairds of Restalrig, Drylaw, and Pitadrow. These must submit themselves unconditionally, and their fate be determined by the queen of England, according to the treaty already made between her majesty and his sovereign.¹

This stern reply made it evident to these unfortunate men, that the Regent would be contented with nothing but their lives, and convinced of this they rejected his terms, and declared their resolution to abide the worst. But this was no longer in their power, for the soldiers began to mutiny, threatened to hang the Secretary over the walls within six hours if he did not advise a surrender, and were ready to deliver the captain and his companions to the enemy.² In this dread dilemma an expedient was adopted, suggested probably by the fertile brain of Lethington. Grange, after refusing the

¹ Copy of the time, St. P. Off. "The Regent's answer to the Castilians," May 28, 1573. Also St. P. Off. Copy, "Conditions of rendering the castle."

² MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Killigrew to Burghley, 20 June. 1573.

terms in open conference sent a secret message to Drury, in consequence of which two companies of the besieging force were admitted within the walls on the night of the 29th, and to them in the morning he and his companions surrendered, expressly stating, that they submitted, not to the regent of Scotland, but to the queen of England, and her general, Sir William Drury. They were accordingly carried to his quarters, and notwithstanding some remonstrances upon the part of the regent, received with courtesy.¹ Morton, however, was not thus to be balked of his prey. He instantly wrote to Burghley, warning him that the chief authors of all the mischief were now remaining without condition in the hands of Elizabeth's ministers, intreating the queen's immediate decision upon their fate, and requesting them to be delivered to him, that they might suffer for their crimes.² Killigrew, too, had the barbarity to advise their execution, and Drury anxiously awaited his next orders. At this trying moment, Grange and Lethington addressed the following letter to one

¹ MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Sir W. Drury to Burghley, Leith, June 5, 1573. There is a passage in his letter which is curious. He says, "By computation there hath been near 3000 great shot bestowed against the castle in this service, and the bullets of all or the most part recovered, and brought again part by our own labours, and part by the Scots paying to the Scottish people a piece of their coin called a *bawbee* for every bullet, which is in value English, one penny and a quarter."

² MS. Letter, Caligula, C. IV. fol. 85. Morton to Burghley, 31 May, 1573.

who had once been knit to them in ties of the strictest friendship, the Lord Treasurer Burghley.

“ My Lord—The malice of our enemies is the more increased against us, that they have seen us rendered in the Queen’s majesty’s will ; and now to seek refuge at her Highness’s hands. And, therefore, we doubt not, but they will go about by all means possible to procure our mischief ; yea, that their cruel minds shall lead them to that impudency to crave our bloods at her majesty’s hands. But whatsoever their malice be, we cannot fear that it shall take success, knowing with how gracious a princess we have to do, which hath given so many good proofs to the world of her clemency and mild nature, that we cannot mistrust, that the first example of the contrary shall be shown upon us. We take this to be her very natural, *Parcere subjectis, et debellare superbos*.

“ We have rendered ourselves to her majesty, which to our own countrymen we would never have done, for no extremity [that] might have come. We trust her majesty will not put us out of her hands to make any others, especially our mortal enemy, our masters. If it will please her majesty to extend her most gracious clemency towards us, she may be as assured to have us as perpetually at her devotion as any of this nation ; yea, as any subject of her own, for now with honour we may oblige ourselves to her majesty farther than before we might, and her majesty’s benefit will bind us perpetually. In the case we are in

we must confess we are of small value. Yet may her majesty put us in case, that perhaps hereafter we will be able to serve her majesty's turn, which, occasion being offered, assuredly there shall be no inlack of good will. Your lordship knoweth already what our request is. We pray your lordship to further it. There was never time, wherein your lordship's friendship might stand us in such stead. As we have oftentimes heretofore tasted thereof, so we humbly pray you let it not inlack us now in time of this our great misery, when we have more need than ever we had. Whatsoever our deservings have been, forget not your own good natural. If by your lordship's mediation, her majesty conserve us, your lordship shall have us perpetually bound to do you service. * * Let not the misreports of our enemies prevail against us. When we are in her majesty's hands she may make us what pleaseth her. * * * From Edinburgh, the 1st June, 1573."¹

This letter produced no effect. Elizabeth, indeed, did not instantly decide, and requested particular information to be sent her of the "quality and quantity of the prisoners' offences, but Killigrew and Morton so strongly advised their execution, that the queen commanded them to be delivered up to the regent, to be dealt with as he pleased. This, as she must have known, was equivalent to signing their death warrant. Before,

¹ MS. Letter, Brit. Mus. Caligula, C. iv. fol. 86. Lethington and Grange to Lord Burghley, 1st June, 1573.

however, the final order arrived, Lethington died in prison. It was reported that he had swallowed poison, but the rumour was uncertain, and was treated by many as an invention of his enemies.¹ Ten days after this, Drury reluctantly complied with the orders of Elizabeth, and delivered Grange, Hume, John Maitland Lethington's younger brother, and Robert Melvil, to the regent;² Grange's brother Sir James Kirkaldy being already in Morton's hands.

Much interest was now exerted to save the life of Grange, but without success. He had made himself too conspicuous, and his talents for war were much dreaded by his adversaries. A hundred gentlemen his friends and kinsmen, offered for his pardon to become perpetual servants to the house of Angus and Morton in "Bond of Manrent," a species of obligation well known in those times, and to pay two thousand pounds to the regent, besides an annuity of three thousand merks; but although Morton's prevailing vice was avarice, he was compelled to resist the temptation, influenced, as he stated in a letter to Killigrew, by the "denunciations of the preachers,"³ who cried out that God's plague would

¹ Brit. Mus. Caligula, C. iv. fol. 97.—Copy. Elizabeth to Morton, 9th June, 1573. Ibid. fol. 101, Killigrew to Burghley, 13th June, 1573. Also MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Killigrew to Burghley, 20th June, 1573.

² MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Drury to Burghley, Leith, June 18, 1573.

³ MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Morton to Killigrew, Aug. 5, 1573. See Notes and Illustrations, No. xii. Diurnal of Occurrents, p. 336.

not cease till the land were purged with blood. They were aware of the prediction of Knox so recently uttered upon his death-bed, that Grange should be shamefully dragged from the rock wherein he trusted, and hanged in the face of the sun. The success of Drury had fulfilled the first part, and the violence with which the ministers opposed every intercession for mercy, affords a melancholy proof of their determination that the second head of the reputed prophecy should be as punctually accomplished.

Nor were they disappointed. On the 3rd of August Sir William Kirkaldy and his brother were brought from Holyrood to the cross of Edinburgh, and executed in the presence of an immense concourse of spectators. They were attended on the scaffold by Mr. David Lindsay, a martial clergyman of those times, to whose hands, if we may believe Melvil, it was difficult to say whether the bible or the hagbut were most congenial instruments. Grange received his ministrations with gratitude, and expressed on the scaffold deep penitence for his sins, and unshaken attachment to his captive sovereign.¹

Thus died the famous Laird of Grange, a gentleman who, although his character will not bear examination if we look to consistency and public

¹ MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Killigrew to Burghley, Aug. 3, 1573. Melvil's Diary, p. 26, 27, 28.

principle, was justly reputed one of the best soldiers and most accomplished cavaliers of his time.¹

The year 1573 was thus fatal to the cause of Mary, whose last hope expired with the execution of this brave man, and the surrender of the Castle of Edinburgh. In England she had seen all her plans blasted by the death of Norfolk, and the imprisonment of the Bishop of Ross. To France she could no longer look for active interference in her behalf, for Elizabeth had recently entered into the defensive treaty of Blois, with that kingdom, and Catherine of Medicis was negotiating a marriage between the English Queen, and her son, the Duke D'Alençon, a proposal hollow indeed, and insincere on both sides, yet, for the time, rendering all interference with Scotland on the part of France unadvisable. Even Spain she could no longer regard with any confidence. The Duke of Alva was the friend and secret correspondent of Burghley and Elizabeth; and although the Roman Catholic refugees in Flanders were incessant in their intrigues, and Philip himself seemed disposed to annoy her on the side of Ireland and Scotland, the influence of this minister effectually counteracted any decided enterprise.² With the death of Kirkaldy,

¹ Melvil's *Memoirs*, p. 257. His character of Grange is very expressive' "He was," says he, "humble, gentle, and meek, like a lamb in the house, but a lion in the field—a lusty, stark, and well-proportioned personage, and of a hardy and magnanimous courage." See also Melvil's *Diary*, p. 28.

² Gonzalez, p. 370, 371.

therefore, the reign of Mary properly terminates, for immediately after that event, her last intrepid supporter, Sir Adam Gordon of Auchendown retired to France, and from that period till her death, no subject dared to acknowledge her as his sovereign.

PROOFS AND ILLUSTRATIONS

FROM

M A N U S C R I P T S

CHIEFLY IN

HER MAJESTY'S STATE PAPER OFFICE,

HITHERTO UNPRINTED.

PROOFS AND ILLUSTRATIONS.

I.

HISTORICAL REMARKS ON KNOX'S IMPLICATION IN RICCIO'S MURDER.

History, p. 26.

It has long been known, that some of the principal supporters of the Protestant cause in Scotland were implicated in the assassination of Riccio ; but it has hitherto been believed that their great ecclesiastical leader Knox was not privy to this murder. From the language, in which the event is told in his history it might be inferred, indeed, that he did not condemn the assassination of one whom he regarded as a bitter enemy to the truth.¹ "After this manner above specified," says he, "to wit by the death of David Rizzio, the noblemen were relieved of their trouble, and restored to their places and rowmes,² and likewise the Church reformed, and all that professed the Evangel within this realm, after fasting and prayer were delivered ;" but in weighing this passage it is to be remembered, that although the Fifth Book of Knox's history was probably composed from notes and collections left by the reformer, it was not written by him.³ The late Dr. Macrie, his excellent biographer, has this sentence upon the subject, which from the authority deservedly attached to his life of Knox may be taken as the present popular belief upon the point. "There

¹ Knox's History, p. 344.

² Offices.

³ Mc'Crie's Life of Knox by Dr. Crichton, pp. 250, 416, and Prefatory Notice to Bannatyne's Memorials, p. 20.

is no reason to think that he (Knox) was privy to the conspiracy which proved fatal to Riccio. But it is probable that he had expressed his satisfaction at an event which contributed to the safety of religion and of the Commonwealth, if not also his approbation of the conduct of the conspirators.”¹

As Dr. Macrie had not the advantage of consulting those letters upon this subject which I have found in the State Paper Office, and by which the whole secret history of the conspiracy against Riccio has been developed, we are not to wonder that he should have spoken so decisively of Knox's innocence of any previous knowledge of the plot. I shall now state as clearly as I can, the evidence upon which I have affirmed in the text that he was precognizant of the intended murder—adding, at the same time, some letters which may be quoted in his defence.

The reader is already aware that Riccio was assassinated on the 9th of March, 1565-6; that Ruthven, Morton, Lethington, fled on the queen's escape and meditated advance to Edinburgh (March 18th), and that while other accomplices secreted themselves in Scotland, Morton and Ruthven took refuge in England. Such being the state of things, on the 21st of March the Earl of Bedford then at Berwick, of which he was governor, thus wrote to Cecil,—

“You shall understand that the Lord Ruthven is come hither for his own safety, who, passing thro Tiviotdale came to Wark Castle, and being troubled with sickness, and therefore weak, tarried the longer upon the way thence, afore he came here. I received him, (as I have learned that the ancient order is in like cases) and so mean to do such other as shall for like purpose come. He keepeth most commonly his bed for that small time that he hath as yet tarried here, and therefore is not so likely to depart hence of some good time.

“The Earl Morton is gone towards Carlisle, and from thence will take his way towards Newcastle, and so hitherward for some time, to talk with the Lord Ruthven. The Lord Lindsay and the Laird of Liddington are both gone to the Earl of Athol for their safeguard—Liddington, as I hear, will come hither if by any means he can, whereof as it cometh to pass you shall further understand.

¹ Life of Knox, p. 253, edited by Dr. Crichton.

“The Earls of Argile, Glencairn, and Rothes, have received their dress,¹ and so are in quiet, or at the least in hope they shall be quiet. The Earl of Murray, the Lairds of Grange and Patarro, and the tutor of Pitcur have refused the like dress, as the other have received, seeming thereby the less willing to receive the dress offered them for that these lords their friends were excluded out of the favor and pardon, and so hardly putt at—yet it is thought they will receive it, for so in any wise have these lords now abroad desired them.

“Their King remaineth utter enemy to these lords now abroad, notwithstanding his former doings with them. Hereof and for that Mr. Randolph *writeth also more at large of the names of such as now be gone abroad*, I shall not trouble you therewith.”² * * *

This letter was written from Berwick eleven days after the murder, and about a week after the flight of the conspirators, here called “those that be gone abroad,” and we see, that in the last sentence Bedford mentions to Cecil, that he will not trouble him with any farther details, as Mr. Randolph was at that very time writing to him, and would send in his letter the names of the conspirators who had gone abroad.

This letter of Randolph is accordingly in the State Paper Office, and pinned to it I found the promised list of names.³ I shall first give the letter, and then the “list.” The letter, which is addressed to Cecil, is wholly in Randolph’s hand—the list is in the hand of a clerk who I find at that time was employed in his confidential correspondence by Bedford.³ The letter, which is addressed to Cecil, is as follows:—

RANDOLPH TO CECIL.

Berwick, 21st *March*, 1565-6.

“May it please your honor,

“Since Mr. Carew’s departure hence, this hath happened. The queen, to be revenged upon the lords that gave the last attemptate and slew David, is content to remit unto the former

¹ Pardon.

² MS. Letter, St. P. Off. B.C. Bedford to Cecil. Berwick, this 21st March, 1565.

³ This list is now bound up with the volume. See the handwriting of letter, St. P. Off. B. C. Bedford to Cecil, 27 March, 1568,

lords, with whom she was so grievously offended, all that they had done at any time against her, who, seeing now their liberty and restitution offered unto them, were all content saving my Lord of Murray, to leave the other lords that were the occasion of their return, and took several appointment as they could get it, of which the first was the Earl of Glencairn, next Rothes, Argile, and so every one after other, saving, as I said, my Lord of Murray, with him Patarro and Grayne, [Grange] who, standing so much upon their honours, and promise, will not leave the other, without some likelihood to do them good.

• “The lords of the last attemptate, which were these: Morton, Ruthven, Lindsay, and Liddington, finding these men fall from them whom they trusted so much in, and for whose cause they had so far ventured themselves, found it best to save themselves in time, and therefore, upon Sunday last,¹ every one of the four above named, departed their several way, my Lord of Morton towards the West borders, my Lord Ruthven through Tividale, and so came to Wark, and yesterday to this town. The Lord Lindsay into Fife, Liddington to Athol, to my L. there, either to be saved by him, or to purchase his pardon of the Q. which is thought will be so hard as may be, and therefore is he looked for very shortly to be in this country, if he can escape.

“Besides these that were the principal takers in hand of this matter, there are also these, the Laird of Ormiston, Hawton, his son-in-law, Cawder, his nephew, Brunston, Whyttyingham, Andrew Car of Fawlsyde, Justice Clerk brother, George Douglas, and some other. Of the town of Edinburgh divers, so that as I judge, there are as many like to take hurt in this action, as were in the former. What is become of any of these I know not as yet, saving Andrew Car that came to this town with the L. Ruthven and his son.

“The Q. upon Monday last,² returned to Edinburgh. In her company the Earls Bothwell, Huntly, Marshall, Hume, Seton, with as many as there [they] were able to bring with them. Where she was wont to be carried in a chair by four of her

¹ i. e. Sunday, 17th March.

² i. e. Monday, 18th March.

guard, she is yet able to ride upon a horse, though by her own account she hath not six weeks to her time. She lodgeth not in the Abbey, but in a house in the town in the High-street. Her husband hath disclosed all that he knew of any man, and yet hath given his hand, and subscribed divers bands and writings, testifying that to be his own deed, and done by his commandment. It is said, that he gave him one blow himself, and to signify that the deed was his, his dagger was left standing in his body after he was dead. Their mind was to have hanged him, but because business rose in the court between the Earl Bothwell and such as were appointed to keep the house, they went the next way to work with him." * * * At Berwick, the 21st March, 1565.

This letter explains itself, and needs no comment. The list of the names which was pinned to it is as follows. It bears this indorsement in the hand of Cecil's Clerk.

" Martii, 1565.

" Names of such as were consenting to the death of David."

" THE EARL MORTON.	LOCHLEVEN.
THE L. RUTHVEN.	ELPHINSTON.
THE L. LINDSAY.	PATRICK MURRAY.
THE SECRETARY.	PATRICK BALLANTYNE
THE MR. OF RUTHVEN.	GEORGE DOUGLAS.
LAIRDS	ANDREW KAR OF FAWDONSYDE.
ORMISTON.	JOHN KNOX. } Preachers. ¹
BRUNSTON.	JOHN CRAG. }
HAUGHTON.	

" All these were at the death of Davy and privy thereunto, and

¹ Spelt thus in original :—

TH'ERLE MURTON.	LOUGHLYVINE.
THE L. RYVEN.	ELVINGSTON.
THE L. LYNNESEY.	PATRICK MURRY.
THE SECREATORY.	PATRICK BALLENTYNE.
THE MR. OF RYVEN.	GEORGE DUGLAS.
LARDS	ANDRO KAR OF FAWDONSYDE.
ORMESTON.	JOHN KNOX. } Preachers.
BRYANSTON.	JOHN CRAG. }
HAUGHTON.	

are now in displeasure with the Q. and their houses taken and spoiled."¹

The inference from all this seems to me inevitable ; namely that in an authentic list sent to Secretary Cecil by Bedford and Randolph, the name of John Knox is given as one of those who were privy and consenting to the death of David Riccio. Now that these two persons, the Earl of Bedford and Randolph were intimately acquainted with the whole details of the conspiracy, has been proved in the text.² To the proof there given I shall merely add part of a letter of Bedford to Cecil, written, it is to be observed, on the 11th of March, the unhappy man having been murdered on the evening of the 9th of March.

"After my hearty commendations—yesterday in the morning the Earl of Murray and the other lords, and the rest entered into Scotland, and went that night to Edinburgh * * These lords make account to find great aid in Scotland, so as shortly things will fall out in more open sort than as yet, whereof from time to time you shall be advertised * * Since the writing hitherto certain advertisement is come that David is dispatched and dead. That it should be so you have heard before. The manner and circumstances thereof I will not now trouble you withal. By my next I hope I shall have somewhat else to say, and then will I write more at large. * * * F. BEDFORD."

"From Berwick this 11th March, 1565."

The evidence, therefore, is direct and clear, and comes from those who must be esteemed the best witnesses in such a case. But there are other circumstances which strongly corroborate it, as far as Knox is concerned. The reformer was then the great leader and adviser of the party of the Kirk. Riccio was regarded as its bitter enemy, an opponent of God, an oppressor and tyrant over God's people,³ and we know that Knox conceived it lawful for private individuals to put such persons to death, provided all re-

¹ It is certain that this cannot mean that all whose names are to be found in this list were personally present at the act of the murder ; it should be understood to mean that " all these were at the murder of Davy or privy thereto."

² See pp. 29 et seqq.

Macrie's Life of Knox, by Dr. Crichton, pp. 253.

dress in the ordinary course of justice was rendered impossible.³ "The truth is," says Dr. Macrie, in his reflections upon the death of Beaton, "he (Knox) held the opinion that persons who by the commission of flagrant crimes, had forfeited their lives, according to the law of God, and the just laws of society, such as notorious murderers, and tyrants, might warrantably be put to death by private individuals, provided all redress in the ordinary course of justice was rendered impossible, in consequence of the offenders having usurped the executive authority, or being systematically protected by oppressive rulers."¹

Now, keeping this in mind, we find Morton and Ruthven, the leading conspirators, informing Cecil in a letter from Berwick, written on the 27th March, that the great end proposed by them in the murder of Riccio, was to prevent the universal subversion of religion within Scotland; and they add this remarkable sentence, "and to the execution of the said enterprise the most honest and most worthy were easily induced to approve, and fortify the king's deliberation in the premises, howbeit in action and manner of execution, more were followed of the king's advice, kindled by an extreme choler, than we deliberated to have done."² Who then were these persons named here "the most honest and most worthy?" Evidently none else than the heads of the Protestant party, Morton and Ruthven, Lethington, Lindsay, and Ochiltree, the barons of Ormiston, Brunston, Calder, Hatton, Lochleven and others in Scotland, with Cecil, himself, and Bedford, and Randolph, the great supporters of the Protestant cause in England. And here it is to be noted that these barons of Ormiston, Brunston, Calder, and Hatton, were dear and intimate personal friends of Knox, whilst Ochiltree was his father-in-law. The reformer also, as we have seen, was the confidential correspondent of Bedford and Cecil, the associate in the common cause for the support of religion with Morton and Lethington, and undoubtedly the most powerful and influential of all the ministers or leaders of the Kirk. If called upon, therefore, to believe that the list which

¹ Macrie's Life of Knox, with notes, by Dr. Crichton, p. 27.

² MS. Letter, St. P. Off. 27 March, 1565. Morton and Ruthven to Cecil.

³ Macrie's Life of Knox by Dr. Crichton, pp. 25, 101, 171, 242.

implicates him is a forged document, and that he had no foreknowledge of the murder of Riccio, we are to believe, that in a plot formed by the party of which he was the leader, in which all his friends were implicated, the object of which was to support that form of faith which was dearer to him than life, by the commission of an act, of which, from his avowed principles, they knew that he would not disapprove;¹ they studiously declined his assistance, concealed all that was to happen, and preferred for the first time in their lives to act without him. This supposition seems to me, I confess, untenable; and when I find Bedford and Randolph transmitting his name as one of the conspirators to Cecil, I cannot escape from giving credit to their assertion.

Another corroboration of his accession to this conspiracy was his precipitate flight from Edinburgh with the rest of the conspirators, upon the threatened advance of the queen to the city. His colleague Craig, it is to be observed, who was afterwards accused by his parishioners as having been too much a favourer of the queen, remained in the city; but Knox fled precipitately, and in extreme agony of spirit to Kyle, and as we have already seen, did not venture to return till the noblemen rose against the queen after the death of Darnley.² If he was not implicated, why did he take guilt to himself by flight?

There is a passage to be found in the manuscript history of Calderwood, which is worth noticing upon this point. It has been quoted by Dr. Macrie,³ and is as follows, "King James the VI. having found great fault with Knox for approving of the assassination of Riccio, one of the ministers said, that the slaughter of David, as far as it was the work of God *was allowed by Mr. Knox*, and not otherwise," Calderwood, MS. ad annum 1591. "Knox himself," adds Dr. Macrie, "does not make this quali-

¹ Dr. Macrie, in noticing Knox's flight from Edinburgh, after the murder, states, that "it is probable he had expressed his satisfaction at an event which contributed to the safety of religion and the commonwealth, if not also his approbation of the conduct of the conspirators." Macrie's Life of Knox, by Dr. Crichton, pp. 253, 254.

² See his prayer added to his Answer to Tyrie, quoted in Macrie's Life, Note G to Period 8th.

³ Macrie's Life of Knox by Dr. Crichton, p. 254.

fication, when he mentions the subject incidentally." It is not clear, however, whether this sentence refers to Knox's allowance, or approval of the murder before or after the deed. It is lastly to be remembered, that Riccio was a Roman Catholic, consequently in Knox's eyes an Idolater; and that the reformer and his party held that Idolatry might justly be punishable by death. "Into this sentiment they were led," says Dr. Macrie, "in consequence of their having adopted the untenable opinion, that the judicial laws given to the Jewish nation were binding upon Christian nations, as to all offences against the moral law."¹

Such is the evidence which appears to me conclusive in support of the fact stated in the text. Let me now mention two circumstances which may be quoted in defence of Knox, and in proof of his innocence of this charge.

The first list, including Knox's name as one privy to Riccio's death, is, as we have seen, preserved in the State Paper Office, attached to a letter, dated 21st March. But there is another list in the British Museum, dated the 27th of March, which does not include the reformer's name, or that of Craig his colleague. It is in the handwriting of Randolph, and is entitled, "The names of such as were doers, and of council, in the late attempt for the killing of the secretary David at Edinburgh, 9th March, 1566, as contained in the account sent to the council of England, by the Earl of Bedford, Lieutenant of the North, and Sir Thomas Randolph, ambassador from England to Scotland at the time, dated at Berwick, 27th March, 1566." This account or letter of the 27th of March has been printed from the original in the Cotton collection,² by Sir Henry Ellis, vol. ii. p. 207, along with the list of the names.

The second circumstance is this—when Morton and Ruthven fled to Berwick, and sent to Bedford a vindication of their proceedings with the intent that he should communicate it to Cecil and Elizabeth, they positively denied that any of the ministers of Scotland were art and part in the conspiracy, and accused the Papists of having raised the report. "It is come to our know-

¹ Macrie's Life of Knox, p. 246.

² Caligula, B. X. fol. 337.

ledge (they say) that some Papists have bruited that these our proceedings have been at the instigation of the ministers of Scotland. We assure your lordship upon our honour, that there were none of them art nor part of that deed, nor were participate thereof.”¹

And now it may be asked, why do you reject the evidence of this second list, and why are we not to believe this solemn declaration absolving the ministers of Scotland, and of course Knox with them, from all participation in the murder. To this I answer, that there is no evidence to raise doubt that the list given on the 21st March was written in good faith, while the event was yet new, after the arrival of Lord Ruthven, and without any object but that of transmitting information to Cecil, while that of the 27th March sent to the council of England, was carefully prepared after the failure of the conspiracy by the escape of the queen, and when the cautious and politic Morton had reached Berwick; that these lords would have an especial object in keeping the names of Knox and Craig out of the list is evidenced by the above extract, and that they would have little scruple to such a suppression is clear from the manner in which they submit their narrative to Cecil, to be amended and qualified at his pleasure. That the Secretary of Elizabeth did modify and recast the story after the failure of the conspiracy, and with the approbation, or by the directions of Elizabeth, is expressly asserted by one who appears to have had an intimate acquaintance with the whole plot against Riccio. “*La Regina d’Inghilterra*,” says he, “*quale era stata causa del tutto, intendendo la pace fra il Re e Regina di Scotia, s’attristo molto e fece scrivere per il suo Secretario Cecille, per tutto il regno, che la causa di tutto il suddetto, era perche il Re haveva trovato il detto Ricciolo a dormire con la Regina. Il che non fu mai vero.*”² The extent to which this modification and alteration was not only permitted, but invited, to be carried, may be gathered from a passage in a letter of Morton and Ruthven to Secretary Cecil, sending him their account of the conspiracy and mur-

¹ Harleian, No. 289, fol. 96. Endorsed in Cecil’s handwriting. Copy of Instructions to my Lord of Bedford, from the Lords of Morton and Rewhen (Ruthven) 1566. This date of the year is not in Cecil’s hand.

² *Avvisi di Scotia*. See *Postea*, p. 440.

der.¹ “If, (say they, alluding to their enclosed narrative) there be any thing that be hardly written, that might have been *cuthit*² in gentler terms, we will most humbly request your honour *to supply us therein, to amend and qualify as your wisdom thinks good, any thing that you think extreme or rudely handled.*—It is our meaning after the return of your honour’s answer *with this copy corrected*, if so you find good, to send copies of that matter in France, Scotland, and such other places needful, as shall be thought necessary for staying of false and untrue reports and rumours.”—And lastly it is quite evident from a passage in Bedford’s and Randolph’s letter of the 27th March, giving the account of the murder, and sending the list of the names, that the chief authorities consulted for both account and list, were Morton and Ruthven, whose object it was, to suppress the names of the ministers which appeared in the first list.³

So far then as to the preference given of the first list to the second—but then comes the question—Why not believe Morton, when he states upon his word of honour, that none of the Ministers of Scotland were art and part of that deed? I answer, because according to Morton’s notions, being art and part, or participate in any action or crime, was a totally different thing from being privy to it, or cognizant of it before it was committed. Morton, according to the distinction which he made on his own trial, might have asserted with perfect honour, that neither Knox nor any of the ministers were participate in Riccio’s murder, and yet he may have been perfectly aware that Knox was privy to the murder, knew that it was about to be committed, and according to the expression used to the king by one of their number, allowed of it, that is, gave a silent consent to it, so far as he considered it to be the work of God, for the destruction of an enemy of the truth

¹ MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Morton and Ruthven to Cecil. Berwick, 2d April, 1566. Endorsed by Cecil’s clerk. Earl Morton and Lord Ruthven to my Mr. with the Discourse touching the killing of David.

² Expressed.

³ Bedford and Randolph say “Having conferred the reports from abroad which came to our knowledge with the sayings of those noblemen, the *Lord Morton, and the Lord Ruthven that are present*, and of them all that which we have found nearest to the truth, or, as we believe, the truth itself, have here put them in writing.”—27 March, 1566.—Ellis Vol. ii.

and an idolater.—I say confidently, Morton made this distinction, because he tells us so himself in his own trial and subsequent confession. “When” says Spottiswood¹ “the Earl of Montrose, Chancellor of the Assize, declared him (Morton) convicted of counsel, concealing, and being art and part, of the king’s murder, at these last words he showed himself much grieved, and beating the ground once or twice with a little staff he carried in his hand, said, ‘*art and part, art and part—God knoweth the contrary.*’—Then it was said to him, apparently my Lord, ye cannot justly complain of the sentence that is given against you, seeing that with your own mouth ye confess the foreknowledge, and concealing of the king’s murder.—He answered, I know that to be true, indeed, but yet they should have considered the danger that the revealing of it would have brought to me at that time. * * And howbeit they have condemned me of art and part, foreknowledge and concealing of the king’s murder, yet, as I shall answer to God, *I never had yet art or part, red, or counsel in this matter.—I foreknew indeed and concealed it, because I durst not reveal it to any creature for my life.*”²

It is perfectly clear, therefore, that Morton’s declaration that none of the ministers of Scotland were art and part of Riccio’s murder, does not necessarily imply any declaration that Knox had not a fore-knowledge of the murder; on the contrary, it is quite consistent with his having known it, and according to the term used by one of his brethren to James, allowed of it.³

No. II.

PLOT OF LENNOX AND DARNLEY AGAINST MARY’S CROWN AND LIFE.

History p. 23.

In the letter from Randolph to the Earl of Leicester, which is quoted in the text, p. 23, the reader is aware that he alludes darkly to a plot of the king and the Earl of Lennox, his father, to deprive the queen of her crown, perhaps of her liberty and life. “I know, says he, these practices in hand contrived between the father and son to come by the crown against her will * *. I

¹ Spottiswood, p. 313.

² Bannatyne’s Memorials, p. 319.

³ Macrie’s Life of Knox, by Dr. Crichton, p. 254.

know that if that take effect which is intended, David shall have his throat cut within these ten days. *Many things grievous and worse than these are brought to my ears, yea, of things intended against her own person, which because I think it better to keep secret than write to Mr. Secretary, I speak not of them but now to your Lordship.*"

It is of great importance in the question of Mary's guilt or innocence, to ascertain the truth of the existence of such a plot against her crown and life by her husband the king, and his father.—and I have found amongst the valuable collections of Prince Labanoff, a paper copied from the Archives of the House of Medici, which strongly corroborates it. I give it here with kind permission. It is thus entitled

AVVISI DI SCOTIA, DELLI 11, 13, & 28, DI MARZO, 1566.

SOPRA GLI ANDAMENTI DI QUEL REGNO.

Li Ribelli di Scotia che stavano in Inghilterra, col consenso del novo Re di Scotia ritornorno a casa loro, e trattavano co il Re suddetto di darli la Corona hereditale, accio che lui restasse Re assoluto, ancora che la Regina morisse senza figlioli.

Detto Re persuadendosi simil fatto, *consentiva alla morte della Regina sua moglie, e gia aveva consentito alla Morte De David Riccio lo Secretario de detta Regina*, et lei aveva fatto riserrar in una camera, con guardia d'Heretici, accio che li Cattolici non la potessero soccorrere, e fra tanto attendevano detti Hereteci, a far che il stato tutto consentisse alla incoronazione di detto Re, et alla privazione del Governo di detta Regina. Al che non consentendo il Popolo, e avendo il Re la mala persuasione fatta a gli da quelli tristi ribaldi, si pente dell' errore, e seno ando dalla Regina, alla quale dopo averla salutata amorevolmente racconto tutto il successo, e gl'adimando perdona del animo suo tristo hauto contra di lei, la quale con piu buon animo, e lieta fronte che puote lo ricevette, dicendoli che non credeva che egli havesse mai hauto simile intentione contra di lei, et che se forse fosse incorso in qualche mancamento di fede, che pregava Iddio gli perdonasse, et lei non solamente gli perdonava ma etiam perdonava a tutti gli altri,

che la perseguitavano, e così subito tutti due si raconsigliorno et cercorono via di salvarsi.

Stando il Re con la Regina gli Heretici credevano che lui trattasse, accioche lei sotto scrivesse certi Capitole che essi adimandavano sopra la perdonanza, et retributione de suoi beni, il che dicendo il Re alla Regina che così aveva promesso di fare, Lei subito diede modo al Re, che se ritornasse da loro con dirgli, che la Regina voleva fare ogni cosa, che a dimandavano, e così se ne andò il Re da essi heretici et lettoli il proposito che fu da loro creduto, gli exortò a mettere la Regina in libertà, promettendo lui di guardarla, che non potesse fuggire, al che loro per compiacere al Re consentivono, e se ne partirono lasciando la Regina in mano del Re suo marito.

Parliti gli heretici, il Re e la Regina mandorono subito per un Capitano loro confidente, il quale vinne con buon numero di soldati Catolici per una parte segreta, che non furono veduti dalli inimici, e gionte da loro maestra se ne fuggirono, a una Fortezza chiamata Don Bar, dove arrivorono al alba del giorno, et ivi aspettorono il soccorso di nove mille fanti Cattolici, con quali andarono contra detti Ribelli, et gli schacciarono di quel suo Regno, et sono ritornati detti Heretici in Inghilterra.

Ritornate il Re et la Regina a Lisleborgo, dove successe il suddetto, fecero tagliar la testa a cinque principali di quella Città authori et inventori di simile impresa.

La Regina d'Inghilterra, *quale era stata causa del tutto* intendendo la pace fra il Re et Regina di Scotia, s'attristo molto et fece scrivere per il suo Secretario Cecille, per tutto il Regno, che la causa di tutto il suddetto, era perche il Re haveva trovato il detto Ricciolo a dormire con la Regina—il che non fu mai vero * * *¹

It is evident that these Advices from Scotland were given by a person on the spot and intimately acquainted with the object and circumstances of the plot against Riccio—and the statement it contains of Darnley's consent to the queen's death is of great importance—for this fact once admitted, and discovered by Mary, her position in reference to a husband whom she knew had plotted against her own life was materially altered.

¹ Filza 3 de Carteggio e affari con la Corte d'Inghilterra. Collated and certified by the Archivista, G. TANFANI.

III.

JOSEPH RICCIO AND JOSEPH LUTYNI.

History, pp. 71, 73.

JOSEPH RICCIO, the brother of David Riccio, came into Scotland with Monsieur de Mauvissiere early in April 1566¹; on the 26th April he was made secretary in his brother's place; and on the 20th June Drury informed Cecil that he was growing apace into favour. JOSEPH LUTYNI was a gentleman in the Scottish queen's service, an intimate friend of Joseph Riccio.²

On the 23rd January 1566-7, Sir William Drury addressed the following letter to Cecil.

DRURY TO CECIL.

23rd January, 1566, *Berwick*.

"Right Honourable,—As this bearer Mr. Throkmorton hath by some necessary business of his own; occasion to repair to the Court, so have I something not unmeet to advertise which is, that at my arrival here, my Lord of Bedford being departed, I found here one Joseph, [Lutyni] an Italian, and a gentleman who had served the Queen of Scots, and despatched with her good favour and license towards France, about certain of her grace's affairs, as by the copy of his passport, accompanied herewith, may appear, who, taking this town in his way, through weak constitution of health, made his stay here for his better recovery, in which mean time I received a letter from the Queen of Scots, purporting a request to apprehend and stay him, for that he had against the laws taken goods and money from some of his fellows, as by the copy of the letter sent herewith, your honour may be informed at length, which since, as appeareth by one that pursueth him, the queen's tailor, is but upon some old reckoning between them; and, therefore, giveth me to think by that I can gather, as well of the mat-

¹ MS. Letter, St. P. Off. B.C. Drury to Cecil, April 20, 1566.

² MS. Letter, St. P. Off. B.C. Drury to Cecil, 20 June, 1566.

ter as of the gentleman, that it is not it that the queen seeketh so much as to recover his person. For, as I have learned, the man had credit there ; and now the queen mistrusteth lest he should offer his service here in England, and thereby might with better occasion utter something either prejudicial to her, or that she would be loath should be disclosed but to those she pleaseth. Whereupon I have thought good to stay the man till such time as the queen's majesty's pleasure, or my lords of the council be signified unto me, which the sooner it be the more shall the poor stranger be eased.

"The occurrents are, the Lord Darly lyeth sick at Glasgo of the small pocks, unto whom the queen came yesterday, that disease beginneth to spread there. The Lord Morton lyeth at the Lord of Whytinghames, where the Lord Bodwell and Ledington came of late to visit. He standeth in good terms for his peace. Here we look for Ledington or Melvyn very shortly to repair. This evening arrived here the ambassador of Savoy, Monsieur de Morett. The return this way of Monsieur le Croc, is also looked for here. Thus having nothing farther to trouble your Honour, I humbly take my leave. From Berwick this 23 January, 1566.¹

WILLIAM DRURY.

Endorsed by Cecil's clerk, Mr. Drury, marshall of Berwick, to my Mr. ——— 23rd January, 1566.

We hear no more of this Italian till the 7th February, 1566-7, when Drury wrote as follows to Cecil on the subject.

DRURY TO CECIL.

Berwick, 7 Feby. 1566-7.

"It may please your Honour to be advertised. This day immediately after my Letter dispatched to the L. Lethington in answer of one of the Queen's and another of his, tending both to one effect, for the delivery of the Italian Joseph, the very copy whereof I send herewith, I received even then one from your H. of the last of January, mentioning some direction of answer concerning the said

¹ St. P. Off. B. C. Drury to Cecil.

Italian.” Drury proceeds to state, that he had not been able to find out from the stranger any matter of much moment. He then adds, “ He (the Italian) doubteth much danger, and so affirmeth unto me that if he return he utterly despaireth of any better speed than a prepared death.¹

On the 19th of February, 1566-7, Drury again thus wrote touching the same Italian to Cecil.

DRURY TO CECIL.

Berwick, Feby. 19, 1566-7.

It may please your H. to be advertised that I have received your letter of the 13th, the 18th of this present, I having before returned the Italian to the Queen sending a gentleman with him, as well to see him safely delivered unto her, as to put the L. of Ledington in mind both of the Queen’s promise, whereof I doubted not, as of his own, that satisfying the debt, he should be in safety returned or restored to his liberty.² * * * *

Lastly, on the 28th February, 1566-7, Drury addressed a letter to Cecil, giving in its first paragraph which follows the sequel of the Italian’s story; his return to Scotland, his examination by Bothwell, and his courteous dismissal.

DRURY TO CECIL.

It may please your honor to be advertised that the Italian here stayd, which the Queen of Scots by her letters required, I did send him unto her by a lieutenant of this garrison. She saw him not, but caused the Earl Bodwell to deal with him, who offered him fair speech to have him to tarry, which he would not yield unto; He satisfied such debt as the taylor could demand of him, others demanding of him nothing, the queen willed to give him 30 crowns, and hath returned him again unto me, who minds to-morrow to take his journey towards London, very well contented as he seemeth to have left Scotland.³ * * *

¹ MS. Letter, St. P. Off. B.C. Drury to Cecil, 7th Feb. 1566.

² MS. Letter, St. P. Off. B.C. Feb. 19, 1566.

³ MS. Letter, St. P. Off. B.C. 28th Feb. 1566.

Having thus given all the letters which relate to this obscure matter, in order that the reader may form his own opinion, I conclude this note by the letter of Joseph Riccio to Joseph Lutyni, the Italian in question, part of which has been quoted in the text. It is endorsed by Cecil thus, "*Joseph Riccio, the Queen of Scots' servant.*"

JOSEPH RICCIO TO JOSEPH LUTYNI.

SIGNOR JOSEPH,

Io ho ditto a la Regina e a Thimoteo che voi m'havete portato via i miei denari, e la causa che io lo ditto e per quel, che voi intenderete.

Quando noi fumo tornati di Starlino Thimoteo domando dove erano i vostri cavalli e le vostre robbe. Io li dissi che le vostre robbe erano drento il vostro coffano, e Lorenzo Cagnoli li disse che voi havevi portato tutto con voi, insieme con i vostri cavalli, e che voi l'havete ditto, "io ho bene abuzato il segretario perche pensa che le miei robbe siano drento il mio coffano, ma non ve nienté.

Quando Thimoteo intese questo comincio a dire, "Cosi m'havete abuzato, Mr. Segretario, la regina me ne fara la' ragione," e cosi trova Bastia e lo fa dire a la Regina, ch'io l'havevo assicurato, che voi eri andato per suoi affari, e che su quello m'haveva prestato cento scudi, e tutti cominciorno a dire che li era qualche cattivaria, e chio la sapeva e che voi havevi buttato le mani nelli pappieri della Regina; e io, che non voleva esser suspessionato, comincio a dire che voi m'havevi portato via sei Portoghese, e cinque nobili, e che m'havete promisso di mi lassare i vostri cavalli, e la Regina subito mi dimanda "Dove sono i miei braccialetti?" e io li dissi che voi li havevi portati conesso voi, e che erano drento la borsa con i miei denari, e Bastia comincia a dire che voi li dovevi sesanta franchi, e cominciano a dire tutti, bisogna mandarli appresso, e fanno tanto, che la Regina comanda a Ledinton di fare una lettera per vi fare arrestare per camino.

In questo mezo, Monsieur di Moretta e arrivato qui, il quale dice che voi li havete ditto, che io ero causa, che voi fate questo viaggio. —Pigliate guardia come voi havete parlato, perche se voi dite per

quello che andavi, noi saremo tutti dui in gran pena. Io ho sempre ditto che voi eri andato per pigliar denari, e per lassar passar la collera della regina che l'haveva contra di voi, e chio vi haveva consigliato cosi, e chio vi haveva prestato denari per far questo viaggio, la somma di sesanta scudi e due Portoghese, perche ancora voi potrete dir cosi, e io o ditto che i denari che voi m'havete portato, per che voi me li avette resi quando voi fussi tornato di francia; e cosi voi et io saremo tutti due scusati. E se voi fate altramente voi sarete causa della mia ruina, e penso che voi non mi vorreste vedere in ruina. Per l'amor di dio fate come s'io fussi vostro figliuolo, e vi prego per l'amor di dio e della buona amisitia che voi m'havete portata et io a voi, di dire come io vi mando, coe di fare questo viaggio per ritirare i vostri denari, e per lassar passar la collera a la Regina, e la sospittio che ella haveva di voi, e che i denari che io o ditto che voi m'havete pigliato, che voi l'havete pigliati per paura che nonvene mancasse per fare il vostro viaggio, e che voi me li haveste resi quando voi fussi tornato, e che non bisognava che io v'havessi fatto un tal brutto,¹ e che voi sete homo da bene, e che non li vorreste haver pigliati, senza rendermeli, a causa che io ero tanto vostro compagno, voi non havette mai pensato che io ne havessi fatto un tal brutto. Et vi prego di non volere esser causa della mia ruina, e se voi dite cosi come vi mando sarete scusato, e io ancora.

La regina vi manda ci pigliare, per parlar; con voi pigliate guardia a voi, che voi la conoscete, pigliate guardia che non v'abbuzi delle sue parole, come voi sapete bene; e m'ha detto che vuol parlare a voi in segreto, e pigliate guardia delli dire come vi ho scritto, e non altramente, a fin che nostra parola, si confronti l'una e l'altra, e ne voi ne io non saremo in pena nessuna, e vi prego di fare quanto v'ho scritto e non altramente. Fatemi intendere innanzi che voi siete qui, la vostra voluntà, et vi prego de haver pieta di me e non voler esser causa della mia morte, e facendo come io vi mando non sarete niente in pena ne io ancora, e io vene saro sempre obligato, e troverete chio lo conoscerò d'una maniera, che voi vene contenterete di me, e vi prego di mi volere scrivere quello che voi volete dire, a fin che io non sia piu in

¹ Sic in orig.

questa pena che io sono innanzi che voi arivate qui, per homo espress.

Altra cosa non vo da scrivere per adesso, perche velo diro quando sarete qui, e vi prego di haver pieta di me, e di voi, perche se voi dite altramente di quel che io v'ho scritto, sarete in pena si ben come me.

Pregando dio che vi dia contentezza di ed lilemburgh questa domenica.²

Vro come buon fratello,

JOSEPH RICCIO.

Vi prego di brugiar la littera appresso che voi l'havete letta.¹

IV.

DARNLEY'S MURDER.

History, p. 83.

I HAVE stated the fact of the king having been strangled, and have added some new particulars regarding the murder, not only on the authority of a letter of Drury to Cecil, but from what I consider a still more unexceptionable piece of evidence, the assertion of Morett, the Savoy ambassador, who was on the spot, and had an opportunity of making himself acquainted with all the circumstances. As this point has been controverted, and some obscurity still hangs over the mode in which the murder was completed, I am happy to be able to publish the following curious and authentic extract from a letter dated at Paris, 16th March, 1567. It forms part of the collections of Prince Labanoff, the original being amongst the Medici papers, to which the prince had access. The letter was written by the Papal Nuntio at Paris to the Grand Duke; and after stating the arrival of Father Edmonds and Monsieur de Morett, the ambassador at Paris, with some other particulars, which I need not mention, it proceeds thus,

“Quanto al particular della morte du quel Re, il detto Signor di

¹ St. P. Off. The letter is thus endorsed in Cecil's hand, Joseph Riccio the Queen of Scots servant.

Muretta ha ferma opinione, che quel povero Principe, sentendo il rumore delle genti che attorniavano la casa, e tentavano con le chiave false apprir gl'usci, volse uscir per una porta che andava al giardino, in camicia, con la pelliccia, per fuggire il pericolo, e quivi fu affogato, e poi condotto fuori dal giardino, in un piccolo horto fuori dalla muraglia della Terra, e che poi con il fuoco ruinassero la casa per amazzar il resto ch'era dentro, di che se ne fa congettura percio che il Re fu trovato morto in camicia, con la pelliccia a canto, et alcune donne che alloggiavano vicino al giardino, affermano d'haver udito gridar il Re: "Eh fratelli miei habbiate pieta di me per amor di colui, che ebbe misericordia di tutto il mondo," et il P. Edmondo m'afferma, che il Re questa mattina, haveva secondo il suo solito udita la messa, e che era stato sempre allevato della madre Cattolicamente, ma che per desiderio di regnare alle volte dissimulava l'antica religione, se, cosi è' degni sua divina maesta haver misericordia di quella povera anima. * * *

Parigi, 16 de Marzo, 1567.

Collated and certified by the Archivista, G. Tanfani, 17th February, 1840.

The following letters from Drury to Cecil, give us some additional particulars relative to the murder of the king, and Bothwell's trial and conduct after it:

DRURY TO CECIL.

St. P. Off. B. C. Berwick, Feb. 28, 1566-7.

May it please your honour, &c.

* * *

There hath been other bills bestowed¹ upon the church doors, as upon a tree called the Tron, wherein they speak of a smith who should make the key, and offers, (so there might be assurance of the living that by proclamation was offered) he and others will

Sic. in Orig.

with their bodies approve these to be the devisers, and upon the same venture their lives.

There was at the meeting at Dunkeld the Earls Murray, Morton, Athol, and Caithness, the L. Oglebie, the L. Glamis, Lindsay, and others. John Hepburn, sometime Captain under the Earl Bodwell of the Harmitage, is thought to be one of the executors of this cruel enterprise, there is one Hughe Leader also suspected. I am promised to understand the certainty. His servant Sandy Duram, a Scottish man, is thought also to know some part. I will not write of so much as the Scots speak themselves, and some of them of credit.

Standen and Nelson, with some others that served the Lord Darnley, as I hear, are referred for their wages to the Provost of Edinburgh. The Lord of Craigmillar, and the Earl Bodwell, hath promised to give Standen a horse. Hudson, a man of good years, with the rest of the musitianers, came this other day to Seton, to the queen, and required her license that they might repair into their country. She dissuaded them to the contrary, saying unto them, you have lost a good master, but if you will tarry you shall find me not only a good mistress, but a mother. But they mind again to move her, and as I hear, minds to return. There is with her at Seton, Argile, Huntly, Bodwell, and Livingston, the Lord Seton is gone to Newbottle, having left the whole house to the queen, so she is there of her own provision, and minds, as I am advertised, to tarry there till near unto Easter. There is in hand to have the lords assemble in Edinburgh. She hath twice sent for the Earl of Murray, who stayeth himself by my ladie in her sickness. It is said that the Lord Fleming shall be the Earl Bodwell's deputy at Anwick, for suppression of the rebels of Liddesdale, and that certain of the soldiers are gone from Edinburgh to the Harmitage there to remain.

There was a rich ship of Shetland, bound to Flanders, lost this last week at Holy Island, receiving a leak, coming from Lieth. She was laden with fells, hides, and leaden ore. The Frenchmen that I wrote of in my last letters, that took shipping at Lieth, have been put in by weather into the Holy Island, and there have remained these eight days past.

Edward Collingwood, one of this garrison horsemen, is returned from the Earl Bodwell, having remained with him in Scotland this quarter of this year. I have upon respects committed him to ward : by my next letters your honour shall understand more. The gates of Seton are very straitly kept. Captain Cullen, with his company have the credit nearest her person.

The Earl of Bodwell, was on Thursday at Edinburgh, where he openly declared, affirming the same by his oath, that if he knew who were the setters up of the bills and writings, he would wash his hands in their blood. His followers, who are to the number of fifty, follow him very near. Their gesture, as his, is of the people much noted. They seem to go near and about him, as though there were that would harm him, and his hand as he talks with any that is not assured unto him, upon his dagger, with a strange countenance as the beholders of him thinks. Even as the L. Darnley, and his servant William Taylor, lay in the house in distance one from the other, even so, as also otherwise¹, were they found together. Signior Francis, as I hear, minds to pass this way within six or eight days.

I send your Lordship here the copy of some of the Bills set up, whereby you may see how undutifully the doers of the same doth behave themselves against their Sovereign. I have thought it my part as well to send to you this, as I have done in the rest, for that I would if you should so think it meet, that her majesty, my Sovereign, should understand all that comes to my knowledge of the proceedings in these parts. The Lady Bodwell is, I am by divers means informed, extremely sick, and not likely to live. They will say there, she is marvellously swollen.—Even now is brought me that the Queen came upon Wednesday at night to the Lord Whawtons² house, seven miles off this side, dined by the way at a place called Tranent, belonging to the L. Seton, where he and the Earl of Huntly paid for the dinner, the Queen and the Earl Bodwell having, at a match of shooting, won the same of them. There is a proclamation made in Edinburgh, forbidding all persons for raising up any of the stones or timber at the house.

¹ Sic. in Orig. There must be some mistake in Drury's mode of expressing himself, as the text implies a contradiction.

² Probably Hawton.

where the L. Darnley was murdered.—There is one of Edinburgh that affirms how Mr. James Bafourde bought of him powder as much as he should have paid three score pounds Scottish, but he must parforme¹ it with oyle to that value. Bafourde came to Edinburgh upon Wednesday at night, accompanied to the Tower with thirty horsemen—when he was near unto the Tower, he lighted, and came in a secret way; [one] is now come to me of this Tower that saw him when he came; he is hateful to the people. This person of this tower assures me also, that yesterday, being Thursday, before he departed thence, he saw a bill having been set up the night before, where were these letters written in Roman hand, very great. M. R.

With a sword in a hand near the same letters; Then a L. B. with a mallet near them, which mallet they in their writing called a mell. These being even now brought me and affirmed by him that saw it, I have also thought it my part to advertise your honour of, that her Maj. my Sovereign, may know all that passes, as much as comes to my knowledge, wherein I think I do my duty, which if I understand from you that it be not so taken, I shall cease from it, and do according to your direction; for I only desire from your honour that I may from time to time receive your advice, how best I may here employ my time to deserve her Majesty's favour and liking. How I have spent my time sithence my last coming in remedying of things needful for her highness's service, your honour may by others understand.

I have received divers requests made unto me by them that hath come from Scotland for the receiving of Standen and his company. I have answered, I will neither advise them to come, nor promise them any favour; and minds if they come to commit them to ward till I understand from you her Majesty's pleasure, which it may please you to signify unto me.

The L. of Cessford and Fernyhurst, with the chief of both parties are now at Edinburgh for the continuance of the agreement amongst them, which agreement, as it is thought, will breed no great good to the Queen's Maj. my Sovereign, her subjects

¹ Parfume.

upon the borders, for the being agreed, they will rob and spoil faster by their reding.¹ * * * &c.

W. DRURY.

V.

BOTHWELL'S TRIAL.

The following is the Letter to Cecil alluded to in the Text.

DRURY TO CECIL.

Text, pp. 97, 98.

15th April, 1567, St. P. Off. B.C.

“Right Honble.—The Queen's Majesty's letter directed to the Queen of Scots, I received the 11th hereof at x of the clock, which forthwith I discharged by the Provost Marshall here, who in mine opinion was not the unmeetest I could chuse for the purpose.

“He arrived at the court the 12th at six in the morning, and then used his dilligence immediately to deliver his letter, which he had in charge, to the Queen, attending some good space in court, procuring all that he might by the means of such as were near her person, who told him it was early and that her majesty was asleep, and therefore advised him to tarry some time thereabouts, till she arose, which he did, going out of the court into the town, and shortly after returned, she being not yet risen, and therefore walked about till 9 or almost 10 o'clock, when all the lords and gentlemen were assembled taking their horse; and then, thinking his opportunity aptest, going into the court as a little before he did, (the contents of the letter he brought, being conjectured and bruted to be for stay of the assize) was denied passage into the court in very uncourteous manner, not without some violence offered; which seeing he could not be permitted to have recourse, as all other persons whatsoever they were, he requested that some gentleman of credit would undertake faithfully to deli-

¹ By their reding, i. e., by their agreement—in consequence of their agreement they will be able to rob the faster.

ver his letter, from the Queen's majesty of England, to the queen their sovereign, which none would seem to undertake.

"Upon this came unto him the parson of Oldhamestock, sur-named Hepborne, who told him that the Earl Bodwell had sent him with this message, "that the earl understanding he had letters for the queen, would advise him to retire him to his ease, or about some other his business, for the queen was so molested and disquieted with the business of that day, that he saw no likelihood of any meet time to serve his turn, till after the assize."

"Then came the Lord of Skirling, who asked him, if his letter were either from the Council or the Queen's majesty, he told him from the Queen's majesty only. Then, said he, ye shall be soon discharged, and so returning into the Court, desired the said person to keep him company at the gate which he did, and therewith espieng a Scottish man, whom he had for his guide, took occasion to reprehend and threaten him of hanging, for bringing English villains as sought to and procured the stay of the Assize, with words of more reproach.

"In this instant Ledington was coming out and Bodwell with him, at the which all the lords and gentlemen mounted on horseback, till that Ledington came to him demanding him [of] the letter, which he delivered; then Bodwell and he returned to the Queen, and stayed there within, half an hour, the whole troop of lords and gentlemen still on horseback, attending for his coming. Ledington seemed willing till have passed by the Provost without any speech; but he pressed towards him and asked him if the Queen's majesty had perused the letter, and what service it would please her majesty to command him back again.

"He answered, that as yet the Queen was sleeping, and therefore had not delivered the letters, and thought that there would not be any meet time for it till after the assize, wherefore he willed him to attend, so giving place to the (throng) of people that passed, which was great; and by the estimation of men of good judgment above 4000 gentlemen besides others. The Earl Bodwell passed with a merry and lusty cheer, attended on with all the soldiers, being 200 all harkebuzers to the Tolbooth, and there kept the door, that none might enter but such as were more for the behoof of

the one side than the other. The assize began between x and xi, and ended vii in the afternoon.

“The Earl of Argile and Huntly, [were] chief judges ; what particularly was done or said there, I cannot yet learn, more than that there were two advocates called Crawford and Cunningham, for the Earl of Lennox, who accused the Earl Bodwell for the murder of the king, alleging certain documents for the same, and desiring forty days term longer, for the more perfect and readier collection of his proofs.”

There is another original letter of Drury's written about this time, which is a fragment, and without the date of month or day. It consists of disjointed pieces of news sent from Scotland by some one of those many spies, from whom Drury received information, “The guard,” says he, “of the soldiers of Bodwell, he going to be tried by the assize, and their keeping of the door is much disliked of.” “Bothwell immediately after the trial set up a cartel of defiance ; he would fight any one (except a defamed person) who accused him of the king's death. If I thought it might stand with the queen my Sovereign her favor, I would answer it and commit the sequel to God, I have for me sufficient to charge him with, and would prove it upon his body, as willingly as I would receive the obtaining of my sute, required of the queen's majesty. I have here caused the draught of a letter to her majesty humbly craving your honor's judgment of it. The marriage of the queen to Bodwell, and the death of the prince is presently looked for. I send you here inclosed the ploughman's bill, if your honor shall think it good to show it to her majesty. There is another worse which I am promised.

“The Cardinal did send a very gentle letter to the Lord of Murray by Clarenock, also credit by mouth, craving pardon for the past, for that he had born him evil will, but now finding that though his religion were contrary to his, yet his honest, honourable doings, and the care that he was now surely persuaded he hath tofore had of this queen here, and his sound dealing with her, ever, moved him now to think himself beholden unto him. Monsieur de Croc seems much to dislike the earl's departure, and says so to the queen. She answered, he went away for debt, but

she wept at his departure, wishing he were not so precise in religion. She wished him to go to Flanders, and to visit neither England nor France.

“ It was Captain Cullen’s persuasion, for more surety, to have the king strangled, and not only to trust to the train of powder, affirming he had known many so saved. Sir Andro Carr, with others, was on horseback near unto the place, for aid to the cruel enterprise if need had been. The Lady Coldingham, now wife to the young Mr. of Caithness, and sister to the Earl Bodwell, is in credit, and in the place of the Lady Benes, now out of court. Suspicion banished the one and placed the other. I dare not say, as others that knows more says.

“ Great means was used to have had the Earl of Murray staid in the town till the cruel deed had been done. The Bishop of Glasco, Ambassador for Scotland in France, hath written to the queen, and to others which the queen hath understanding off, that nothing likes her of the death of the king. * * The king was long of dying, and to his strength made debate for his life. The Lord David, son to the duke, is mad, and Arbroath, his brother, hath already had a show of the same disease. * * There accompanied the Earl of Murray to the boundary, his brother the Lord of Holyrood-house, the Lord Hume, and the chief of the gentlemen of the March, and some of Lothian, as Brymstone and others. The king would often read and sing the 55th Psalm, and went over it a few hours before his death. There were not many that he would of his griefs deal with, but to some he would say he should be slain, and complain him much of his being hardly dealt with. Even now by the under-marshall I received this more. His own evil handling. He only kept out of the court, pushed out as it were by force, thrust upon the breast with extremity, in the sight of divers gentlemen, which seemed much to mislike therewith.

“ A bill set up, ‘ Farewell gentyll Henry, but a vengeance of Mary.’ The Queen sent a token and message to Bodwell being at the assise.¹ The Queen upon Thursday last, past through the street unto the market, where there were women sitting that had

¹ By Drury to Cecil, Border Corr. 24th April, 1567.

to sell. They rysse as she came near, crying aloud, ‘God save your grace, if you be sakeless of the king’s deade (of the king’s death).’ The queen’s advocates, that should have inveighed against Bodwell, are much condemned for their ~~silence~~. The like at an assize hath not been used. * * Bodwell rode upon the courser that was the king’s, when he rode to the assize. The nobility long tarried his coming a horseback, to accompany him. There was that followed him above iiii thousand, whereof the greatest part were gentlemen, besides they that were [in] the streets, which were more in number. The streets were full from the Canongate to the Castle.

“Ledington and others told the Under-Marshall, that the queen was asleep when he himself saw her looking out at a window, showed him by one of La Croke’s servants, a Frenchman, and Ledington’s wife with her, and Bodwell after he was a horseback looked up, and she gave him a friendly nod for a farewell; for till it was known the Under-marshall’s errand as the contents of the letter, he had liberty in court, but not after, when he was once out, suffered to go in again.”

VI.

MARY’S MARRIAGE WITH BOTHWELL.

Text, p. 123.

It is remarked in the text, p. 123, that the queen, although making a show of contentment was really wretched. The following letter of de Croc, the French ambassador, was written three days after her marriage with Bothwell, but recounts an interview which the ambassador had with Mary on her marriage day. It is taken from the MSS. collections of Prince Labanoff. The original is in the Bibliotheque Royale at Paris. Collection de Harlay, No. 218.

Depeche de Monsieur de Croc a Catherine de Medicis, du 18 Mai, 1567.

Madame,—Les lettres que j’escript a V. M. par le dit Evesque (de Dumblane) sont pour estre leues; Vous pouvez penser que je

ne me fye a lui quoi que je vous escrive. Vos Majestes ne sauraient mieux faire que de luy faire mauvaise chere, et trouvez bien mauvaise le mariage, car il est tres malheureux, et desja l'on n'est pas à s'en repentir. Leudi, Sa majeste m'envoya quérir, on je m'apperceus d'une estrange façon entre elle et son Mary, ce que elle me voullut excuser, disant que si je la voyois triste, c'estoit pour ce qu'elle ne vouloit se rejouyr comme elle dit ne le faire jamais, ne desirant que la mort.¹

Hier estant renfermez tous deux dedans un cabinet avec le Compte de Bodwell, elle cria tout hault, que on luy baillast ung couteau pour se tuer. Ceulx qui estoient dedans la chambre, dans la piece qui precedoit le Cabinet, l'entendirent. Ils pensent que si Dieu luy aide qu'elle se desespera. Je l'ay conseillé et confortée de mieux que j'ay peu ces trois fois que je l'ay veu.

Son Mary ne la fera pas longue, car il est trop hay en ce royaume et puis l'on ne cessera jamais que la mort de Roy ne soyt seüe. Il n'ya ici pas un seul Seingneur de Nom, que le dit Compte de Bodwell, et le Compte de Craffort; les autres sont mandés, et ne veullent point venir.

Elle a envoyé qu'ils s'assemblent en quelque lieu nommé, et je les aille trouver pour leur parler au nom du Roy, et voir si je y pourrez faire quelque chose. Sil advient j'y ferez tout ce qu'il me sera possible, et apres, le meilleur est de me retirer, et comme je vous ayt mander, les laisser jouer leur jeu. Il n'est point séant que je y sois au nom du Roy; Car si je favorise la Royne l'on pensera en ce Royaume, et en Angleterre, que le Roy tient la main à tout ce qui se fait, et si ce n'eust esté le commandement que V. M. me feyrent, je fust party huict jours devant les nopces. Si est ce que j'ay parlez bien hault, dequoy tout ce royaume est assez abberuvez,² et je ne me suis point voullu brasser³ a ses nopces; ni depuis ne l'ay point voullu recongnoistre comme Mary de la Royne. Je crois qu'il escrira à V. M. par le dit Evesque de Dumblane; Vous ne luy debvez point faire de responce, &c. &c.

¹ This conversation it is to be particularly noted, occurred on the very day of Mary's marriage to Bothwell—the 15th of May.

² Instruit.

³ Participer.

VII.

MARY'S ESCAPE FROM LOCHLEVEN.

Text, p. 211.

The following minute account of the Queen's escape from Lochleven, which is my authority for the new and interesting circumstances given in the text, was communicated by John Beaton, brother of the Archbishop of Glasgow, to the king of France, and transmitted by Petrucci, the envoy or ambassador of the Grand Duke, Cosmo de Medicis, to his master, in a letter dated at Paris, 21st of May, 1568. It is taken from the MSS. Collections of Prince Labanoff, who found the original in the secret Archives of the House of Medici. Beaton, it will be observed, was on the spot watching at Kinross, for the Queen on the evening she made her escape. He was a principal contriver of the escape, and an eyewitness and earwitness of all.

MODO CHE LA REGINA DI SCOTIA HA USATO PER LIBERARSI
DALLA PRIGIONE.

Advisato detta Regina di Scotia Monsignor di Seton suo confidentissimo Cattolico et molto valoroso cavaliere, per via d'un putto di casa, il quale non ritorno poi, egli si condusse per il giorno d'iterminato con circa 50 cavalli, presso al Lago di Loclevin, dove la Regina era tenuta prigioniera, restando pero egli con 40 di loro, fra certe montagne poco lontano per non essere scoperti da quelli del Castello del lago, e piu presso si fecero gli altri dieci, che smontarono in un vilaggio vicino al lago, mostrando esservi per transito, uno de quali ando in ripa al lago prossimo, et stava col corpo disteso in terra per non esser veduto, aspettando, che la Regina uscisse, secondo l'ordine.

Alla porta del Castello, si facevano le guardie continuati, giorno e notte, eccetto che mentre ci cenava, nel qual tempo, si chiudeva la Porta con una chiave, andando ogniuno a cena, e la chiave

stava sempre sulla tavola, dove il Castellano mangiava, e davanti a lui. Il Castellano è fratello uterino del Conte de Murray Regente de Scozia, fratello naturale della Regina, e suo mortal nimico.

La Regina doppo provato di calarsi da una finestra, e non li era riuscito, fece tanto che un paggio del Castellano, il quale essa haver a cio disposto, portando la seconda sera di Maggio un piatto in tavola, con una servietta innanzi al padrone, le misse sopra la chiave, e quella tolse e porto via—che alcuno non s'en'accorse, andato subito dalla Regina le disse il tutto, e ella che tra tanto s'era messe le vesti della maggior di quelle due cameriere, che le havevano lassate, menando seco per mano la minore, che puo essere una figlia di 10 anni, n'ando col paggio chetamente alla porta et aperta se n'uscì con lui, e con la putta, e serrata la per di fuori con la medesima chiave, senza laquale non si poteva aprire, ne anco di dentro, entra in un piccol batello, che quivi si teneva per servizio del Castello, e spiegato un suo velo bianco, con un fiocco rosso, fe il segno concertato, a chi l'attendeva che ella veniva, al quale segno quello che era disteso in terra su la riva del lago, levato si, e con un altro segno advisati li Cavaliere del Vilaggio (fra quali era principale, quello che e venuto qua a dar conto di questo fatto a questi Maesta, che e fratello del Ambasciatore di Scotia qua,) e da loro advisati poi quelli della Montagna furono subito al lago, e la Regina che col paggio remando al meglio che poteva, di la con la Dio gratia s' era condotta; raccolsero con infinita allegrezza e messa la a cavallo, col paggio e con la putta, la menarono al Mare 5 miglia indi discosto, per cio che l'andare sempre per terra, dove havevano disegnato saria stato loro di manifesto pericolo.

Imbarcatisi tutti la condussero a Nidri luogo ti Monsignore di Seiton e di la poi a Amilton, Castello del Duca di Sciatelero, la dove Monsignore d'Arcivescovo di Santa Andrea suo fratello, con altri principali de quelle parte l'accolsero e rivererono come Regina. Amilton e luogo forte per battaglia di mano e vicino a Don Bertran porto e Castello fortissimo 4 leghe, ma la Regina non si retira la' si perche e ben sicura in Amilton, comandando a tutta quella contrada, Monsignor S'Andrea sudetto, e non altri, si per poter recever meglio quei che anderano ad-adjutarla la, che in una

fortezza forse non saria cosi, alla quale pero in ogni caso si puo condurre da una sera, a un'altra accadendo.

Tutto quel regno e in moto, chi per la Regina, chi contro di lei col conte di Moray—Ella ha mandato questo Gentilhuomo¹ a mandar per hora mille Archebusieri a queste Maesta, ma che se vorra recuperare, Edinburg, citta principale, e l'altre fortezze occupate da ribelli, hara bisogno d'esser adjutata da ogni banda, e ha scritta una lettera al Cardinale di Loreno che moveria ogni cuore duro a compassione di lei, et le prime linee sono che ella domanda perdona a Dio et al Mondo de gli errori passati della sua giovinezza, che ricognosci la sua liberazione solo da sua divina Maesta, e che le ne rendeva, humilissime gratie, che le habbia dato tanto spirito in queste sue afflictioni, che non si sia mai punto mossa dal suo fermo proponimento di voler vivere e morir Cattolica, come intende hora de voler far piu che mai.

Collated and Signed by L'ARCHIVISTA.

G. TANFANI.

Dal Archivio Mediceo.

le 17 Febbrajo, 1840.

In a letter preserved amongst the Morton MSS., from Sir William Kirkaldy to the Laird of Lochleven, dated June 1st, 1568, there is the following passage.

“ Seeing that all thir three taik no effect, this last was tane in hand and executed, devised by the Queen's self, George, and the lad Willie, and Cursell was on the Counsel, who received all writings, messages, and tokens from Willie sent by George to the queen, I can try no more of your servants to have been on this Counsel. * * As to them that came in company with the L. Seton I need not to tell you their names, but James Wardlaw was the guide, and laid them quietly in the hill, where they might see the going in and out of the boat—when, I know farther ye shall understand it, &c.” 1st June, 1568.

¹ Namely, John Beaton.

VIII.

BATTLE OF LANGSYDE.

Text p. 220.

The following account of this battle is taken from an original in the State Paper Office, entitled,

ADVERTISEMENT OF THE CONFLICT IN SCOTLAND.

[The blanks are left in consequence of the original being in those places injured.]

16 May, 1568.

The Queen's number was six thousand.

The Earl of Argyle her Lieutenant General.

The Company of the Lords was esteemed to be four thousand.

The Hamiltons had the vaunt garde of the Queen's part assisted with others to the number of two thousand. Both companies did strive for a Hill nigh adjoining where they met. Their meeting together was in a strait passage thro a village. The Lord Hume, the Lord Semple, and the Lord Morton, had the vauntgard on that side. The fight endured at the least three quarters of an hour without giving back. The Queen's party first gave way, and then pursued¹ . . . at the beginning of which chase Th' Earl of Murray willed and required all his to spare for shedding of more blood. Otherwise as many as were on foot which were the greatest number, had been in their Enemys will, for the h . . . whereof the lord Haris was general, fled and . . . within the horses of them that were lighted of the Company.

The Queen beheld this Conflict within half a mile distant, standing upon a hill accompanied with Lord Boyd, the Lord Fleming, and the Lord Harris son, with thirty others, who seeing the Company overthrown took the way to² Dumbarton who was so near pursued that she could not take the boat that should bring her into Dumbarton, but was driven to take the way to Dumfries, where she as yet remaineth. The estimation of the number that was slain in the place where they fought, by the view of them that

¹ Sic. in Orig.

² The four following lines are scored through in orig. to "remaineth."

have skill, is judged to be six or seven score, besides those that have died since being brought into the Town, and other places which daily die. And taken prisoners of that side to the number of 300 and more, whereof the Lord Seaton, the Lord Ross, Sir James Hamilton, the Mr. Montgomery, the Mr. Cassillis, the Sheriff of Ayr, the Sheriff of Lithgow, who bore the Hamilton's standard in the vantgarde, himself being a Hamilton, the young laird of Preston, the Laird of Innerwick, the Laird of Pitmilley, and the Laird of Baweirg Andro Melvin, the Laird of Boyne, and Robert Melvin, Captain Anstruther, the Laird of Trabrowne, two sons to the Bishop of St. Andrews, if one of them not slain, a son to the Abbot of Kylwinnon. The rest of the number that is taken of the three hundred is all of the surname of the Hamiltons and their allya, Alexr. Stewart a Captain of footmen slain.

John Hamilton of Millbourne, Mr. of the Household to the Duke, also slain. John Hamilton of Ormiston slain.

The prisoners for the most part are all put in the Castle of Glasgow. Of the Lords side never a man of name slain. Divers sore hurt. The Lord Hume hurt in the leg and face, and overthrown and relieved by his own men. The Lord Ochiltree sore hurt and in danger of his life, at the skirmish on horseback in the morning, receiving his chief wound with a sword in his neck, given by the Lord Harris, whose son in the revenge of his father's hurt had slain the Lord Seaton had not the Earl of Murray, saved him after his being yielded. Andro Kar of Fawdonside likewise hurt in danger of his life with divers others gentlemen sore hurt.

The Earl of Argile, even as they were joining, as it is reported, for fault of courage and spirit, swooned. There were divers of the Queen's part taken and not brought in, for there was the father against the son, and brother against brother, as namely, three of the Melvyns of the Lords' side, and two of the Queen's, which was Robert and Andro. After the fight had long continued, a gentleman of the highland called Macfarlane, who not xx days before for his misbehaviour was condemned to die, and yet at the suit of the Countess of Murray, had his pardon, and now accompanied with two hundred of his countrymen was a wing to the vauntgarde of th' East side, and came in and executed great

slaughter by whom the victory was not thought least to be atchieved.

The Earl of Huntly was coming to the Queen with . . . with great speed, untill . . . got the warst, and then . . . of Field pieces of brass there was x, which the Lords also wan. And the Mr. Gunner, with a great piece from the Lords' side.

The day following, being the 14th, the Earl sent to summon the Castle of Hamilton. The answer respaited till the next morning, and he that had the charge thereof came to Glasgow and offered the keys to the Earl of Murray upon his knees, and said, that if it pleased to send any thither to receive it, he should, and he answered, that he would go himself, and so did, and took it that day himself about 12 hours, and within few hours afterwards went to Draffen, but how he hath therein prevailed, I yet know not, but shall at the return of those two, that I have yet remaining there.

The Earl of Athol, notwithstanding his promise made to the lords, neither he nor any of his came. The Laird of Grange had the charge of the horsemen of the Lords' side, who that day played his part. The French Ambassador was either at Hamilton or in the Field the day of their meeting. The Earl of Eglinton being of the Queen's side, bestowed himself in a house and there covered with straw till the night, and then escaped.

The noblemen that were with the Queen. The Earl of Argile, Th' Earl of Eglinton, The Earl of Cassillis brother, with his friends. The Earl of Rothes, the Lord Boyd, the Lord Fleming, the L. Levyston, the Lord Seaton, the Lord Ross, the Lord Yester, the Lord Borthwick, the Lord Claude, son to the Duke, Sir James Hamilton . . . the Sheriff of Lithgow, the L. . . and of Garleys, the L. Weemys, of Fife, with all the whole force of Galloway and Liddesdale.

That day the Earl of Murray went to receive the Castle of Hamilton, certain of his horsemen ran a foray, and got many naggs, whereupon the poor people made a great lamentation, and immediately thereupon he caused proclamation to be made that their goods should be delivered again, and no spoil to be made.

IX.

AN ORDER FOR MARY'S EXECUTION IN 1569.

Text p. 292.

The following is the letter of Leicester referred to in the text. It was politely communicated to me by John Bruce, Esq., a well known and able antiquary, and secretary to the Camden Society. He conjectures that it was written to Secretary Walsingham, but the address does not appear on the letter. It is preserved in a MS. volume belonging to Frederick Ouvry, Esq., by whose permission it is now printed. The volume was written, as Mr. Bruce conjectures, about the beginning of the seventeenth century, and contains transcripts of many letters written by Leicester, from the Low Countries. I have in vain searched for the original of this letter in the State Paper Office. The fact which it mentions, that a great seal was sent for Mary's execution of a sudden, at the time of Northumberland and Westmoreland's rebellion is, as far as I know new.

LEICESTER TO —————

10th October, 1585.

"I have written very earnestly, both to her Majesty and my Lord Treasurer, and partly also to yourself and Mr. Vice Chamberlain, for the furtherance of justice in [on] the Queen of Scots; and believe me if you shall defer it, either for a parliament or a great session, you will hazard her majesty more than ever, for time to be given is that the traitors and enemies to her will desire.

"Remember how upon a less cause, how effectually all the council of England, once dealt with her majesty *for justice to be done upon that person*, for being suspected and infamed to be consenting with Northumberland and Westmoreland in the rebellion. You *know the Great Seal of England was sent then and thought just and meet, upon the sudden for her execution.* Shall now her

consent and practice for the destruction of her majesty's person, be used with more [regard] to her danger than the less found fault? Surely I tremble at it, for I do assure myself of a new more desperate attempt if you shall fall to such temporising solemnities; and her majesty cannot but mislike you all for it, for who can warrant these villains from her if that person live, or shall live any time? God forbid; and be you all stout and resolute in this speedy execution, or be condemned of all the world for ever. It is most certain if you will have her majesty safe, it must be done, for justice doth crave it, besides policy. It is the cause I send this poor lame man, who will needs be the messenger for this matter; he hath bidden such pain and travel here, as you will not believe. A faithful creature he is to her majesty as ever lived. I pray you, let her not¹ retain him still now, even to save his life, for you know the time of the year is past for such a man to be in the field; yet will he needs be so, and means to return, and you must procure his stay as without my knowledge, or else I lose him for ever; but if he come hither it is not like if he can continue; he deserves as much as any good heart can do—be his good friend I pray you, and so God bless you—Hast—written in my bed upon a cushion, this 10th, early in the morning.

“Your assured.”

“I pray you let not Candish know I wrote for his stay, but yet procure it in any wise.”

¹ Sic. in original, but it seems incorrect. It should be, I think, “let her retain him still now.”

X.

ELIZABETH'S PLOT FOR THE SECRET EXECUTION OF MARY IN
SCOTLAND.

The following are the Letters which contain the Secret History of
Killigrew's Mission.

HENRY KILLIGREW TO LORDS BURGHLEY AND LEICESTER.

Text p. 380.

Leith, 14th Sept. 1572.

“ May it please your good lordships, I arrived at Berwick the 11th of this present; and after I had some conference with Mr. Marshall, touching my charge, I came to Tantallon, where the Earl Morton had lain sick ten days before. He caused me to stay there all night, by reason whereof many speeches passed, which now for haste I cannot enlarge; but, in sum, it may please your honour to know that he assured me, that for his part he was the same man he always professed himself to be, both for the king, his master's service, and the doing of all good offices to continue the amity with the Queen's Majesty, my sovereign, that he knew of no pensions offered by Monsieur de Croc, nor any practices for conveying the king, etc. La Croc, he seemed not to like, because hitherto he did not acknowledge the king's Authority; but a driver of time in this treaty, which I think will hardly be brought to a good peace, without further trouble, for the great jealousy the one party hath, that the other meaneth but drift of time. He¹ is the king's lieutenant-general on this side Stirling.

“ The news of France doth make them¹, and others startle, and here methinks doth greatly alienate their minds from that king. Where their day of meeting was appointed to be the 10th day of this month, certain of both sides convened together and put it off, till the 20th of this month, at which time the Regent, and the

¹ i. e. Morton.

Earl of Morton, with the king's friends do meet here in Lieth. In this meanwhile, passing towards my Lord Regent to Stirling, I thought good having met Mr. James Melvin by chance in this town, to let them of the castle know of my coming, and of the cause, and of the charge I have to deliver them as soon as I shall have been with the Regent. It seemeth I am not misliked of the other party, and therefore I hope some good will grow, even in the matter I am chiefly sent for, whereof, as soon as I may be able with reason, I shall advertise your honours; and in this meantime, most humbly beseech you to pardon this rude scribbling.

"John Knox is again in Edinburgh, the town guarded; and this also which is somewhat fortified, and in defence with the king's soldiers. From Lieth, this 14th of September, in the morning.¹

"Your Honours' most bounden,

"H. KILLIGREW."

KILLIGREW TO LORDS BURGHLEY AND LEICESTER.

19th Oct. 1572, Stirling.

"May it please your good Lordships to be advertised. I came hither the 16th of this present, at night, and the next day I was bidden to dinner with the regent, and saw the king, who seemed to me a very toward prince of his age, both in wit and person.

"I pressed my Lord Regent's Grace to command some good and reasonable answers to be made unto the form of surety demanded by the Castilians to the end that this abstinence be not neglected as the other was, without doing any thing for the peace, until it was too late, and in this motion I used some speeches to sound his inward liking and devotion to the peace indeed; which I found him to my judgment most desirous thereof. And weary as it were in respect of the burden, charge, and trouble sustained by the Regiment because he findeth not the assistance he looked for, neither at home, nor yet from abroad—

"Touching my motion his grace said, that he had given order to

¹ St. P. Off.

the Abbot of Dumfermling to deliver me at my return to Edinburgh, such answer as his grace and the council had caused to be framed to the Castilians' demands, the which he hoped I should find to be reasonable, and in case there were any thing to their misliking, his grace and the council were contented to be ruled therein by the advice of her Majesty, wherein they nothing doubted the care her majesty had, both of the preservation of their young king and his estate. And by occasion of this speech his grace said moreover to me how he had sent his resolute mind unto my Lord of Morton by the said Abbot *touching the great matter*; wherein I found him now very earnest, insomuch that he desired me to write speedily unto both your honours to further the same by all the good means you might, as the best and as it were the only salve for the cure of the great sores of this commonwealth. I am also put in good hope of the said Abbot that I shall receive a good answer of my Lord of Morton's touching the circumstances et cetera, which I omit to write till the despatch of my courier, by whom I shall be able to satisfy your honors more at length, having only written thus much as it were by the way.

"I perceive the Regent's first coldness grew rather for want of skill how to compass so great a matter, than for lack of good will to execute the same. He desired me also to write unto your honor's to be suitors unto her majesty for some relief of money towards the payment of his soldiers, without the which he shall not be able to do his master that service he desireth" * * *

The rest of the letter is unimportant.¹

KILLIGREW TO LORDS BURGHEY AND LEICESTER.

Text p. 393.

Orig. St. P. Off. November 23rd, 1572.

"My bounden duty most humbly remembered.

"Your honours' letters by Captain Arrington, who brought her Majesty's packet, I received the 22d of this present, in the which

¹ St. P. Off.

your honours do earnestly charge me with two great, yea, very great faults—one that I should have passed my commission in the handling of the great cause, the other, for that I showed myself willing to receive so absurd and unreasonable requests as I sent your honours.

“To the first I answer, with all humbleness, under the correction of your good Lordships, that whatsoever cause my confounded manner of writing gave your honours so to think, yet if it shall be proved ever hereafter that I used her Majesty’s name therein, or passed the bounds of my commission, I will never desire more favour of your honours, but rather that ye would do justice upon me to the example of others.

“I forget not, my Lords, the great charge her Majesty gave me at my coming hither, saying, that no more was privy to this matter, but your honours and I, and that if it came forth, the blame should fall thereafter. I could but promise her Majesty it should be to me as my life, which I trust I have kept, insomuch that when I was advertised that my Lord Keeper, after his coming to the Court, was also made acquainted with the matter, I durst never direct my letters to him, with your Lordships, but thought best to leave the same to your wisdoms. And this is absolute to the first point, whatsoever my Cornish English hath occasioned your honours to gather to the contrary, that I never used her Majesty’s name, nor that I would make any motion for them here, but to your honours alone.

“Now, touching the receiving of the Articles, and transcription of them, I did it not without protestation to the Abbot of Dumfermling, how I utterly disliked them, assuring him farther, that I took them not to any other end, but to know of my Lord of Morton, whether they were according to his meaning. Whereupon I remember the abbot replied, alleging certain causes why he thought her Majesty would never agree to any such thing, therefore that this was a mean to feel your Lordships’ judgments, which saying of his I did insert as near as I could remember them in the letter, and after the ‘Articles.’

“I humbly beseech your honours to consider that this was done at such time as the late Regent lay a dying, which matter and the

sequel thereof did so occupy my head and hand, that I was fain to send those Articles with a confused letter, as it were rather to let your honours see the manner of their dealing (whereof I had given warning before in my other letters), than that I did allow or like of them, and therefore I advertised your honours how I had told my Lord of Morton plainly, that I had not sent them, but only received them of the abbot (who was gone over the water), to know whether they were as his Lordship meant them — who, taking the copy which I had in my hand to show him, after he had read them said, that the abbot had missed in something, and desired me not to send the Articles. I answered, he need not desire me, for though he would give me never so much, I would not do it, and in the end made him see that it was rather a mockery than otherwise.

“ This your honours may trust to is true, although the time were such then, as I could not write all circumstances, and since that time, although I heard some time a glance of the matter, I would never give great ear to it. * * * And truly, my Lords, I was stricken with such sorrow upon the reading of your Letters, I was not able since to brook any thing I took for sustenance. *
* *

“ By your honours bounden,

“ H. KYLLYGREW.¹”

XI.

DEATH OF MAR.

Text, p. 392.

On the day the Regent Mar died at Stirling, namely October 28, 1572, Killigrew the ambassador wrote this letter to the Lords Burghley and Leicester :—

“ May it please your good Lordship, I wrote yesterday to Mr. Secretary of the great danger my Lord Regent was in of his life, but since, he having been let blood, is somewhat amended. My Lord of Morton told me the same day that he had received a letter from Alexander Areskine, the Regent's brother, that there was no

¹ St. P. Off.

hope of life in him, and willed him to provide accordingly, which he did, as your honors shall understand by Captain Arrington, who shall depart hence to-morrow at the farthest, both with their opinions here for the peace, as also *for the matter ye wot of*, which in mine opinion will nothing satisfy your expectation, unless it may be squared and framed to a better and more reasonable proportion, as I think it will upon your answers. I look this night for a man I sent to Stirling, and therefore shall peradventure stay a little the longer, that I may send you perfect word of the Regent's estate. And thus referring all things to Capt. Arrington's letters I most humbly take my leave of your honours, * * *

"H. KYLLYGREW."

XII.

DEATH OF GRANGE.

Text, p. 422.

REGENT MORTON TO KILLIGREW.

Holyrood-house, Aug. 5, 1573.

"After my most hearty commendations, I received your letter from Captain Cockburn as I returned from Stirling towards this town upon the 29th of July, wherein I find a loving continuance of your care and gude will towards the amity of thir^s countries, and friendship to myself. Of the quhilk^s I heartily thank you.

"Upon Monday the 3d of August, Grange, his brother, Mr. James, with Mossman and Cockky, the goldsmiths that made the counterfeit money in the castle, were executed, according to the judgment of the law pronounced against them. And further execution is no yet made. What offers were made on Grange's behalf for safety of his life, I send you herewith the copy, which, as you may consider are large, as meikle⁴ as possibly might

¹ St. P. Off. Killigrew to Burghley and Leicester, 28 October, 1572.

² These.

³ The which.

⁴ As much.

have been offered. Yet considering what has been and daily is spoken by the preachers, that God's plague will not cease quhill¹ the land be purged of blood, and having regard that such as are interested by the death of their friends, the destruction of their houses, and away taking of their goods, could not be satisfied by any offer made to me in particular, quhilk I accepting, should have been cassin² in double inconvenience, I deliberated to let justice proceed as it has done.* * *

"I have written to my Lady Lennox to crave of the Marshall of Berwick, the King, my sovereign's jewels that are in his hands, which he is obliged in honor, and by indenture and promise, made at the encoming of the queen's majesty's forces to deliver in my hands to the king's use. It may be that he will use them liberally now at court, and make friends by them. Therefore, I pray you give advice to my Lady Lennox in what order it is best that she handle this matter." * * *

¹ Until.

² Thrown.

³ St. P. Off.

END OF VOL. VII.

LONDON:

THOMAS CURSON HANSARD, PATERNOSTER-ROW.

